

P/ 546
11
335
So 1372
1912
cop. 2

PROCEEDINGS

TxU

NATIONAL CONVENTION
OF THE

**SOCIALIST
PARTY**



1912

NATIONAL CONVENTION
OF THE
SOCIALIST PARTY

HELD AT

Indianapolis, Ind., May 12 to 18, 1912

STENOGRAPHIC REPORT BY
Wilson E. McDermut, assisted by Charles W. Phillips

Edited by
JOHN SPARGO

Proofs Read and Corrected by
HARRY B. FISH

Published by
THE SOCIALIST PARTY
JOHN M. WORK, National Secretary
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

THE LIBRARY
OF THE UNIVERSITY
OF TEXAS

PROCEEDINGS

OF THE

National Convention of the Socialist Party

Held at Indianapolis, Indiana, Beginning Sunday, May 12, 1912
and Ending Saturday, May 18, 1912

FIRST DAY'S SESSION.

The National Convention of the Socialist Party of America, was called to order by National Secretary John M. Work at Tompkins Hall, Indianapolis, Ind., Sunday, May 12, 1912, at 10 o'clock A. M.

The roll was called by Delegate Strebel of New York, and showed the following named delegates and alternates to be present:

- ALABAMA—G. L. Cox.
- ARIZONA—Erma Hyatt Allen, E. Johnston.
- ARKANSAS—J. de Calvary, Dan Hogen, J. A. C. Mene, A. R. Finks, Briggs, Edw. Adams Cantrell, Geo. W. Downing, Mary E. Garbutt, Job Harriman, E. H. Mizner, R. A. Maynard, A. W. Harris, Ernest L. Rogers, N. A. Richardson, H. C. Truck, J. W. Wells, Fred C. Wheeler, Ethel Whitehead, Jnos. W. Williams, J. Stitt Wilson, Frank E. Wolfe, C. K. Broner, Collins, A. H. Fio, Colorado—W. P. Collins, A. H. Fio, ten, Mary L. Gelfs, Thomas M. Todd, John Tyroell.
- CONNECTICUT—Sam E. Beardsley (at large), Ernest Berger, Edward Perkins, Charles, Chas. T. Feach, Jasper Honck.
- DELAWARE—J. S. Alexander, C. C. Allen, Fred Stanley.
- GEORGIA—Max Wijk.
- IDaho—W. Belmont, Thos. J. Coonrod, Sidney Moley, Isaac Franklin Stewart, Illinois—J. O. Bentall, Bernard Berlyn, Joseph R. Burge, John C. Sjoden, Louis F. Haemer, John C. Kennedy, Marshall E. Kirkpatrick, George Koop, James Small, E. Kirksen, Caroline A. Lowe, F. T. Maxwell, Mary O'Reilly, W. E. Rodriguez, Seymour Steadman, George North Taylor, Guy Underwood.
- INDIANA—Samuel S. Condo, W. W. Farmer, Janet Fenimore, Stephen C. Garbano, William H. Henry, James Oneal, S. M. Reynolds, William Sheffer, Florence Wattles.
- IOWA—Margaret D. Brown, John Jacobsen, Lee W. Lang, Irving S. McCollis.
- KANSAS—Oscar H. Elase, A. W. Rick, L. E. Fuller, May W. Adams, S. M. Stuard, Betty Franklin, Willis, S. M. Stuard, Kentucky—Charles Dobbs, Wall Lantier.
- LOUISIANA—J. R. Jones.
- MAINE—Geo. Allen England.
- MARYLAND—Chas. B. Backman, Dr. Rosett, C. W. Staub.
- MASSACHUSETTS—James E. Fennell, J. A. Cole, Charles E. Fennell, J. A. Cole, J. A. Cole, Robert Lawrence, Patrick M. honey, Rose Tenner, George E. Roew, Jr., Dan A. White.
- MICHIGAN—Frank Ailonen, Jas. H. Kervae, Guy H. Lockwood, Hamilton McMaster, Etta Menton, J. A. C. Menton, Jas. H. McFarland.
- MINNESOTA—Marretta E. Fourni, John H. Grant, Nels S. Hullman, J. S. J. Galls, Olaus Jacobson, Morris Kaplan, Thomas Erwin Latimer, J. G. Maatta, David Morgan, Jay E. Nash, A. O. Devco, O. S. Walkins.
- MISSISSIPPI—M. E. Fritz.
- MISSOURI—Ernest Theo. Behrens, W. Lincoln Garver, Caleb Lipscomb, Geo. W. O'Dam, Otto Viething, W. A. Ward, George.
- MONTANA—Lewis J. Duncan, A. Smith, Jacob M. Kruse, James B. Scott, Philip H. Christman.
- NEBRASKA—Fred J. Warren, Clyde Wright.
- NEVADA—Grant Miller.
- NEW HAMPSHIRE—John P. But.
- NEW JERSEY—Henry Capless, Charles J. Dier, J. K. Gervoe, George H. Goodell, W. son E. Kinnick, Harry F. Kopp, Fredrick Krantz, James M. Kelly, Gust Theinert.



M. A. DONOHUE & COMPANY
PRINTERS, BINDERS, PUBLISHERS
701-727 S. Dearborn St.
CHICAGO

MORNING SESSION, MAY 12, 1912

W. P. Collins, Colorado.
M. A. Smith, Texas. Declined.
The nominations were then closed.
Delegates Strevel, Johnston,
and Oneal were appointed tellers.
A rising vote appointed tellers.
Rodriguez for Hillquit, 70 for Collins,
and 68 for Johnston. The result
was then declared elected chairman
of the day. On taking the chair he spoke
as follows:

John Jones, Dan McCartan, William Pat-
rick, Eugene Powell, Marguerite
Priest, Anna C. Priest, M. Priest, M. Priest,
Anna C. Priest, M. Priest, M. Priest, M. Priest,

Mrs. Katherine Storck, W. Rathen-
 OKLAHOMA—Lawrence A. Nitz, Frederick
 C. Hock, J. M. Branstetter, Car-
 oley E. B. Cumble, Rosecote, Car-
 ol Owen, John G. Willis.
 OKLAHOMA—Marjorie Dorfman, John
 Lewis, Floyd C. Rapp, C.
 PENNSYLVANIA—George W. Bacon, J.
 Hamilton Briggs, Cora Mae Bivley,
 Bradford Hays, Dan M. Caldwell, Leroy
 Owen, John E. Rothen, Frank
 Gonzalez, Richard L. Granger, James
 Morgan, Gertrude L. Granger, James
 Munter, James H. Rea, C. W. Evans,
 Frederick Hall, Merrilee C. W. Evans,
 Shirley Parker, Robert E. Edward, Moore,
 Shurtz, David Alfred Geo. W. R. Riepler, John
 Seeler, Jr., David Williams.
 OKLAHOMA—David Williams.
 WYOMING—Richard C. Young, P. Leitz
 Birch.

[illegible]

SOUTH CAROLINA—William Bernhard,
DORR DAKOTA—Benjamin Dempsey,
TEXAS—Henry Alexander
Chas. A. But, Ed. A. Green, Thos.
Hobbs, Jacob Ernest Richard Melken,
M. A. Smith, J. C. Thompson, L. L.
Homer P. Burr, James A. Smith,
ALABAMA—John Spargo,
MISSISSIPPI—Geo. Milton Norris,
SHINGTON—Josie E. Allen, Adam
With Plains Postford, Edwin J. Brown,
L. W. Williams, Emma D. Cory, H. C. Cop-
land, Alfred Wiley, Kate Sadler,
Sadler, Henry Henseler, Hotel M.

EAST VIRGINIA—C. H. Boswell, E. H.

CONSISTENT—Victor I. Berger, Dan W.
W. R. Gaylord, V. A. Jacobs, Thom-
as, Earl D. Thompson,
ANTHONY—Anthony
J. Shuf, Porter-Garrison, Paul J.
Long, Josef Novak, Leo Laufer, Jos.
Zabaski, Zaslavsky Banka, Christian
Parrish,
National Secretary stated that the
and anticipated

dozen papers organized we had about 100,000. Today we have about 300 dailies, weeklies, monthlies, carrying the gospel of Socialism in thirty languages to all the nationalities, carrying the people of the United States to the United States.

We first organized our party our strength was about 100,000. We had about a similar number and a year later we had about 300,000, and in the next election we doubled or tripled that vote. The Socialist Party has

different parties of first magnitude of selecting the nominees of the United States, whether it be in the subordinate questions of the life of the American people, whether the Socialist Party will show up a million and a half millions strong, will be a historical fact, for a new life in this country.

We have, within the last few years, finally succeeded in demonstrating to a large portion of the working class of this country that the Socialist Party is their only party that truly, fully, at all times, represents their interests and fights their battles, and labor is coming into our ranks in larger and larger numbers every year—aye, every month and every day.

But, comrades, it is not merely our phys-

ical growth, it is not merely our strength upon which we congratulate ourselves in assembling at this convention today. It is the fact that the Socialist Party has at all times remained true to its principles and carried the banner of internationalism and socialism into every country, unshaken by the onslaught of the bourgeoisie and the Socialists (Party bosses) in this country, and this convention is called upon to lay the foundation for the future work, extension and struggles for this party. It is not an exaggeration to say that today there are about three million of Socialists in this country, men and women, voters and non-voters. The eyes of these three millions of people in the United States are focused upon us. They expect us to show the road to the emancipation of the working class, and to lay the foundation for a stronger, more powerful, more efficient instrument for the struggles of the working class in this country.

Max we undertake our work and our tasks with a realization of these great duties which we are to perform. May we remember, all at times during the continuance of this convention, that the work we are called upon to do is work of tremendous importance, and let us not waste time by pettiness, animosity, trifling matters. A suggestion has been made by some comrades that this convention should last about two weeks. No greater mistake could be made, comrades. (Applauding.) We are to let the convention last, if we are to work ourselves into a state of exhaustion where we will be incapable of doing good work, then by all means let it remain in session two weeks or three weeks. But if we are to do the work before us as full-fledged men and women, let us not waste time. Let us dispose of everything within a week. Let us dispose of everything subject that comes before us, (Applauding.) And here another point, comrades. We need not close, on the fact that the work we come here on is different parts of the country, with different and sometimes conflicting views on various questions of policy and tactics. It is well it should be so. No live popular movement can exist without like differences between the adherents of that movement. Comrades, that

of the working class, and let us act accordingly. (Great applause.) The Chairman called for the nomination of a temporary secretary. James Reilly of New Jersey was the only person nominated for Secretary, and was unanimously elected.

THE CHAIRMAN: The next order of business is the adoption of rules. We are not constituted before the adoption of rules.

DEL. GAYLORD (Wis.): If in order, I move to proceed to the adoption of rules.

THE CHAIRMAN: The next order of business is the adoption of rules. We are not constituted before the adoption of rules.

THE CHAIRMAN: These rules have been amended by the National Executive Committee. What we have provided now will be the reading of the proposed rules, as a whole, and we will proceed to do so, section by section. Then I withdraw my motion.

The convention rules prepared by the National Executive Committee were then read by the Secretary.

THE CHAIRMAN: We shall now proceed to discuss the proposed rules serially. Unless there is objection made on the floor to any of the rules mentioned we will defer them adopted.

DEL. GOEBEL: In the event of any

additional new rules, wouldn't it be better to wait till all that you have read are acted on?

THE CHAIRMAN: Additional rules will be entertained after the ones proposed have been disposed of.

DEL. MAHONEY (Mass.): I move that the report of the Committee on Rules be adopted as a whole. (Motion seconded.)

DEL. KAPLAN (Minn.): I move to amend that we take up the report serial. (Seconded.)

The amendment was adopted and the report was taken up *seriatim*.

THE CHAIRMAN: The first rule will now be read, and if there is no objection we will proceed to the next.

Rules 1 and 2 were read and adopted without objection.

Rule 3 was read.

DEL. GOAIZAOU (Pa.): I move to amend that the Secretary shall select the reading order.

The motion was seconded and put and carried, and the rule as amended was adopted.

Rule 4 was read.

DEL. GOAIZAOU: I move to amend by changing the word "elect" to "appoint."

DEL. BERGER (Wis.): Now, Mr. Chairman, we had that rule in that shape originally; it read: to appoint. But that was

When we held the first convention of the United Labor Party, the Unity Convention in Indianapolis, I had perhaps more acrimonious differences thought at that time that the differences between us could never be bridged. But how trivial, how silly do those differences look to us today. How trivial how silly will our tactical differences look to us when we are once in the midst of the actual fight for the working man's (woman's) class.

Let us not forget this, comrades, and let me carry on our deliberations with all the differences, legitimate differences of opinion, differences we have and should have, in the full knowledge that after all we are here for the common cause, the emancipation

changed by the National Executive Committee. As far as I am concerned, I am willing it should be amended to read no as it originally read.

DEL. RICHARDSON (Cal.): "Serjeant-at-arms and assistants." How many? What does that mean? That would leave THE CHAIRMAN? That would leave to the discretion of the appointing or selecting body.

DEL. RICHARDSON: "Then, I move amend by striking out 'and assistants' because that requires his whole committee to elect all the assistants; and to alter that the sergeant-at-arms be authorized to appoint his assistants." That amendment was accepted by D. Gozanson and was carried.

NATIONAL SOCIALIST CONVENTION

MORNING SESSION, MAY 12, 1912

with objection.

DEL. GAYLORD (Wls.): A point of order.

DEL. CHAIRMAN: In this a party press committee for the convention.

DEL. CHAIRMAN: A publicly committee for the convention, as we understood.

DEL. GAYLORD: Not a committee on party press?

DEL. CHAIRMAN: Not on party press.

DEL. GAYLORD: Thank you. Now, I move to amend the title of the Committee for State and Municipal Program, substituting therefor the National Executive Committee and the National Executive Committee and the National Executive Committee.

DEL. BERLYN (Ill.): I move to amend the title of the Committee for State and Municipal Program, substituting therefor the National Executive Committee and the National Executive Committee and the National Executive Committee.

DEL. GAYLORD: I move to amend the title of the Committee for State and Municipal Program, substituting therefor the National Executive Committee and the National Executive Committee and the National Executive Committee.

DEL. BERLYN (Ill.): I move to amend the title of the Committee for State and Municipal Program, substituting therefor the National Executive Committee and the National Executive Committee and the National Executive Committee.

DEL. GAYLORD: I move to amend the title of the Committee for State and Municipal Program, substituting therefor the National Executive Committee and the National Executive Committee and the National Executive Committee.

DEL. BERLYN (Ill.): I move to amend the title of the Committee for State and Municipal Program, substituting therefor the National Executive Committee and the National Executive Committee and the National Executive Committee.

DEL. GAYLORD: I move to amend the title of the Committee for State and Municipal Program, substituting therefor the National Executive Committee and the National Executive Committee and the National Executive Committee.

DEL. BERLYN (Ill.): I move to amend the title of the Committee for State and Municipal Program, substituting therefor the National Executive Committee and the National Executive Committee and the National Executive Committee.

DEL. GAYLORD: I move to amend the title of the Committee for State and Municipal Program, substituting therefor the National Executive Committee and the National Executive Committee and the National Executive Committee.

DEL. BERLYN (Ill.): I move to amend the title of the Committee for State and Municipal Program, substituting therefor the National Executive Committee and the National Executive Committee and the National Executive Committee.

DEL. GAYLORD: I move to amend the title of the Committee for State and Municipal Program, substituting therefor the National Executive Committee and the National Executive Committee and the National Executive Committee.

DEL. BERLYN (Ill.): I move to amend the title of the Committee for State and Municipal Program, substituting therefor the National Executive Committee and the National Executive Committee and the National Executive Committee.

DEL. GAYLORD: I move to amend the title of the Committee for State and Municipal Program, substituting therefor the National Executive Committee and the National Executive Committee and the National Executive Committee.

DEL. BERLYN (Ill.): I move to amend the title of the Committee for State and Municipal Program, substituting therefor the National Executive Committee and the National Executive Committee and the National Executive Committee.

DEL. GAYLORD: I move to amend the title of the Committee for State and Municipal Program, substituting therefor the National Executive Committee and the National Executive Committee and the National Executive Committee.

DEL. BERLYN (Ill.): I move to amend the title of the Committee for State and Municipal Program, substituting therefor the National Executive Committee and the National Executive Committee and the National Executive Committee.

DEL. GAYLORD: I move to amend the title of the Committee for State and Municipal Program, substituting therefor the National Executive Committee and the National Executive Committee and the National Executive Committee.

DEL. BERLYN (Ill.): I move to amend the title of the Committee for State and Municipal Program, substituting therefor the National Executive Committee and the National Executive Committee and the National Executive Committee.

DEL. GAYLORD: I move to amend the title of the Committee for State and Municipal Program, substituting therefor the National Executive Committee and the National Executive Committee and the National Executive Committee.

DEL. BERLYN (Ill.): I move to amend the title of the Committee for State and Municipal Program, substituting therefor the National Executive Committee and the National Executive Committee and the National Executive Committee.

DEL. GAYLORD: I move to amend the title of the Committee for State and Municipal Program, substituting therefor the National Executive Committee and the National Executive Committee and the National Executive Committee.

DEL. BERLYN (Ill.): I move to amend the title of the Committee for State and Municipal Program, substituting therefor the National Executive Committee and the National Executive Committee and the National Executive Committee.

DEL. GAYLORD: I move to amend the title of the Committee for State and Municipal Program, substituting therefor the National Executive Committee and the National Executive Committee and the National Executive Committee.

DEL. BERLYN (Ill.): I move to amend the title of the Committee for State and Municipal Program, substituting therefor the National Executive Committee and the National Executive Committee and the National Executive Committee.

DEL. GAYLORD: I move to amend the title of the Committee for State and Municipal Program, substituting therefor the National Executive Committee and the National Executive Committee and the National Executive Committee.

DEL. BERLYN (Ill.): I move to amend the title of the Committee for State and Municipal Program, substituting therefor the National Executive Committee and the National Executive Committee and the National Executive Committee.

DEL. GAYLORD: I move to amend the title of the Committee for State and Municipal Program, substituting therefor the National Executive Committee and the National Executive Committee and the National Executive Committee.

DEL. BERLYN (Ill.): I move to amend the title of the Committee for State and Municipal Program, substituting therefor the National Executive Committee and the National Executive Committee and the National Executive Committee.

DEL. GAYLORD: I move to amend the title of the Committee for State and Municipal Program, substituting therefor the National Executive Committee and the National Executive Committee and the National Executive Committee.

DEL. BERLYN (Ill.): I move to amend the title of the Committee for State and Municipal Program, substituting therefor the National Executive Committee and the National Executive Committee and the National Executive Committee.

DEL. GAYLORD: I move to amend the title of the Committee for State and Municipal Program, substituting therefor the National Executive Committee and the National Executive Committee and the National Executive Committee.

DEL. BERLYN (Ill.): I move to amend the title of the Committee for State and Municipal Program, substituting therefor the National Executive Committee and the National Executive Committee and the National Executive Committee.

DEL. GAYLORD: I move to amend the title of the Committee for State and Municipal Program, substituting therefor the National Executive Committee and the National Executive Committee and the National Executive Committee.

DEL. BERLYN (Ill.): I move to amend the title of the Committee for State and Municipal Program, substituting therefor the National Executive Committee and the National Executive Committee and the National Executive Committee.

DEL. GAYLORD: I move to amend the title of the Committee for State and Municipal Program, substituting therefor the National Executive Committee and the National Executive Committee and the National Executive Committee.

DEL. BERLYN (Ill.): I move to amend the title of the Committee for State and Municipal Program, substituting therefor the National Executive Committee and the National Executive Committee and the National Executive Committee.

DEL. GAYLORD: I move to amend the title of the Committee for State and Municipal Program, substituting therefor the National Executive Committee and the National Executive Committee and the National Executive Committee.

you are dispensing with the Committee on Contested Delegates?

DEL. CHAIRMAN: There is such an amendment before the house.

DEL. COSGROVE: Well, is it not a fact here yet, and if you dispense with the committee it eliminates a contesting of delegates that might arise?

DEL. CHAIRMAN: If there should be such an occasion this convention will always have a right, under the constitution, to elect such a committee.

DEL. SECRETARY: A committee on State and Municipal Program of seven members. He accepted that.

DEL. SECRETARY: Yes, I accept that.

DEL. OWEN: I now reads "State and Municipal Program of seven members."

DEL. OWEN: I want to find out to what disposition was made of the motion to appoint a Committee on Party Press.

DEL. CHAIRMAN: That is pending before the convention and will be voted on as soon as we reach it.

DEL. OWEN: I want to move to amend that motion by changing the number of members of the committee from 5 to 9.

DEL. CHAIRMAN: What committee are you referring to?

DEL. OWEN: Committee on Party Press, from 5 to 9.

DEL. CHAIRMAN: From 5 to 9, a Committee on Party Press.

DEL. WILSON (Cal.): I desire to state this. That I believe that the Committee on Contested Seats ought to be elected, and it ought to be elected at once, just as reason: That though there may not be any contests between duplicate delegates, there may be some duplicate delegates, and the committee ought to be elected now instead of delaying.

DEL. DUNCAN (Mont.): A point of order. The comrade seems to be discussing something that has already been disposed of.

DEL. DUNCAN: No.

DEL. CHAIRMAN: The question before the house is the size of the Party Press Committee.

DEL. CHAIRMAN: No, the entire rule has been taken on it or the amendment.

DEL. WILSON: My point is this. Any delegate arriving here who is or might be contested ought to have an immediate hearing before such a committee and have and not have to delay until we come back will be left in the original form.

DEL. LOCKWOOD (Mich.): Comrades, that if we are going to try to vote on all these committees and different amendments we are going to get mixed up, and I think it would be very advisable to separate these lists of committees and vote on each one separately. Otherwise we won't know what we are voting for. We can do that and dispose of both for.

DEL. CHAIRMAN: The motion is that we proceed to vote upon each of the proposed committees separately, as far as the committees provided by the constitution are concerned the motion is out of order.

DEL. CHAIRMAN: As far as the few additional suggested committees are concerned it may be entertained.

DEL. COSGROVE (N. J.): I move that the committee not named by the constitution should be taken up separately. (Seconded.)

DEL. GOEBEL (N. J.): What are we going to vote on?

DEL. CHAIRMAN: On all the amendments before.

DEL. GOEBEL: The amendments ought to be taken up separately. I am interested in the proposed rule submitted by the committee on Rules, to which the amendments are as follows and will be voted on in the order stated: First, that as to the committees not named in the constitution we proceed to vote on each one separately. Then there is an amendment to the effect that we dispense with the Committee on Contested Seats. Then another amendment that we also elect a Committee on Party Press, of five members, and an amendment to that amendment that such committee consist of nine.

We now proceed to the first amendment, that we take up separately the committees other than those mentioned in the constitution.

The amendment was carried.

DEL. CHAIRMAN: The amendment we are now going to vote on is the amendment to dispense with the Committee on Contested Seats.

The question was put and the amendment was lost.

DEL. CHAIRMAN: We now proceed to the amendment that we elect a Committee on Party Press, to consist of five and amended to consist of nine. We will divide the motion.

DEL. BERLYN accepted the amendment to increase the committee.

DEL. CHAIRMAN: The amendment is accepted by the mover of the motion. Does the second object? He does not. The amendment before you, then, is the motion that we elect a Committee on Party Press to consist of nine members. All in favor.

DEL. GOEBEL (N. J.): I want to speak on the motion.

DEL. CHAIRMAN: Not while we are voting. You are too late.

DEL. GOEBEL claimed the floor, on the ground that there had been no opportunity for debate on the motion.

The chairman ruled that Del. Goebel was not entitled to the floor.

DEL. THOMPSON (Wis.) appealed from the decision of the chair, and the appeal was sustained.

DEL. GOEBEL: I want to say, in justice to myself, that I should not have appealed from the decision of the chair, even though I thought it was unjust. I do not intend to appeal from the decision of the chair at any time during this convention, even though I do not like the decision. But I do feel that this matter ought to be discussed. We are providing for the appointment of a separate committee to do a certain thing. We have a clause in our national constitution a party paper, that we shall not if it is covered by this motion in itself is covered. If this clause in itself is covered, it must go again to the party papers. Let it go there where it properly belongs. Therefore, I Committee on Constitution. Therefore, I

DEL. SPARGO (Vt.): It seems to me that the fact that we elect or appoint a Committee on Party Press does not mean that the committee so elected must confine its functions to considering the subject of the party ownership of the press. It may or may not consider the subject of the creation of a committee on Party Press and endeavor to have the whole subject of the welfare of our party press considered, and methods devised for improving its efficiency. Few matters of greater importance to our organization will come before us, I therefore urge the comrades to adopt the resolution to create this committee.

DEL. GAYLORD (Wis.): I trust the distinction made by Comrade Spargo may become clear. If it has not already done so, between a party press and a party-owned press. A Committee on Party Press might discuss and report recommendations concerning party ownership of the press, or it might not. The question of the party papers is a big one and interests us all. We are looking for information. I am in favor of the committee.

DEL. BERLYN (Ill.): I want the delegates to vote on this motion intelligently. I do not speak of, nor do I have any intention of dealing with the party-owned press. We have a party press which we recognize in our National Bulletin. The very important ones to take into consideration. There are many things in connection with a movement like ours which are different from any others. This is a haphazard movement. This is an intelligent, organized movement, an expression to give it the most intelligent expression. And the question of the relations of the party to the party press and of the party press to the party, are its principles, and to maintaining are to adopt in the platform which these things and many other things have something to do with the country and the comrades throughout the country are looking for us to do something. I look at this question as being something different from a question of a party-owned press. But if the question does come up it must come up in a different form from the intention of this resolution. I just wanted to make myself plain.

DEL. Solomon (N. Y.) moved the previous question. Carried.

The amendment to elect a committee of nine on party press was then carried, and the rule as amended was adopted.

Rule 8 was then read by the Secretary, on the subject of time allowed speakers.

DEL. TUCK (Cal.): I moved as an amendment that five minutes be substituted for ten minutes. (Seconded.)

DEL. COSGROVE: A point of order. A motion was made to act on these rules separately. You are now going on to another altogether.

DEL. CHAIRMAN: Your point of order is well taken. We will now refer back to the previous paragraph and read the comrades separately.

The Secretary read, under rule 7, "A convention press committee of five members."

DEL. CHAIRMAN: Any objection to such a committee?

DEL. BERGER: I would call it a Publicity Committee. In order to avoid misunderstanding.

DEL. CHAIRMAN: Publicity Committee it is called. Any objection to Publicity Committee?

DEL. CHAIRMAN: No objection.

DEL. CHAIRMAN: No objection.

DEL. CHAIRMAN: No objection.

DEL. CHAIRMAN: No objection.

DEL. CHAIRMAN: No objection.

DEL. CHAIRMAN: No objection.

DEL. CHAIRMAN: No objection.

DEL. CHAIRMAN: No objection.

DEL. CHAIRMAN: No objection.

DEL. CHAIRMAN: No objection.

DEL. CHAIRMAN: No objection.

DEL. CHAIRMAN: No objection.

DEL. CHAIRMAN: No objection.

DEL. CHAIRMAN: No objection.

DEL. CHAIRMAN: No objection.

DEL. CHAIRMAN: No objection.

DEL. CHAIRMAN: No objection.

DEL. CHAIRMAN: No objection.

DEL. CHAIRMAN: No objection.

DEL. CHAIRMAN: No objection.

DEL. CHAIRMAN: No objection.

DEL. CHAIRMAN: No objection.

DEL. CHAIRMAN: No objection.

DEL. CHAIRMAN: No objection.

DEL. CHAIRMAN: No objection.

DEL. CHAIRMAN: No objection.

DEL. CHAIRMAN: No objection.

DEL. CHAIRMAN: No objection.

NATIONAL SOCIALIST CONVENTION.

DEL. HOGAN (Ark.): I move to strike out "press" and insert "publicity."

THE CHAIRMAN: That has been done by request of the committee. No objection to this committee? Next.

The Secretary read the next item, "And the Committee of five members."

DEL. GAYLORD: To go to Chicago and audit the party accounts, everything?

THE CHAIRMAN: No objection. Proceed to the next committee.

The Secretary read the next item, "A Committee on Foreign-Speaking Organizations of Seven Members."

DEL. GAYLORD: Any objection?

THE CHAIRMAN: It seems to me this is a matter which also will come before the Committee on Constitution and Organization. The activities of the foreign-speaking organizations must be worked out in the speaking organizations are something that they concern themselves with. They will do that; they will do it, anyway. I move to strike out this committee because it goes into the Constitution Committee's activities. (Seconded.)

DEL. SOLOMON (N. Y.): We have in the present national constitution different provisions covering foreign-speaking organizations. But this question cannot be settled by a mere provision in the constitution. It requires a special committee, foreign-speaking organizations and their relations to this organization. If you want to deal with the question, I would like to have a committee on the subject.

DEL. WILSON (Cal.): This subject was up before the congress two years ago, and Com. Gaylord remembers himself, that when this question of the organization of foreign comrades came up we were obliged to confer with the foreign comrades themselves in large numbers in order to get some intelligent understanding of the Constitution Committee as to what we ought to do, and they brought to us their suggestions, but these suggest to us that they have not worked out sufficiently. I think it would be a great mistake to leave this to the Constitution Committee. I think that the representation of themselves or at least a sufficient number of them should be placed upon such a committee and have an opportunity, in their report, of assisting, if necessary, the Committee on Constitution. But, at any rate, I think that district committees should be organized for this particular purpose.

DEL. GAYLORD: I withdraw my motion.

DEL. SADLER (Wash.): I move to amend that we increase the Committee on Foreign-Speaking Organizations from seven to nine. (Seconded.)

DEL. BERGER: We accept the amendment.

DEL. PANKIN (N. Y.): I represent a foreign language organization. May I suggest to the convention that it would be a wise thing to have on the committee on the relations of the foreign-speaking groups, some delegates representing foreign groups?

THE CHAIRMAN: I move that an auxiliary committee of three from the foreign branches be appointed. The motion is out of order. The representatives of the foreign-speaking organizations are here with the right to a voice only. It has been customary at the past conventions to have

our Committee on Foreign-Speaking Organizations confer and co-operate with the delegates of these foreign-speaking organizations, and I have no doubt the proceeding will be followed with the proposed motion of Del. Strebel the previous question was ordered.

The question was then put on the motion that a committee on Foreign-Speaking Organizations to consist of nine members be elected, and the motion was carried.

The Secretary read the next item, "A Relations of Labor Organizations and the Relations of the Party to Labor Organizations of seven members."

DEL. JACOBSEN (Iowa): I move to amend by increasing the Committee on Labor Organizations from seven to nine. (Seconded.)

DEL. BERGER: I accept this for the committee. My experience in these conventions, covering a long, long period, is that the smaller the committee, the better it works. However, there is very little difference between seven and nine, and I accept the amendment.

DEL. BYRD (Tex.): I cannot see that it is essential to increase that committee from seven to nine, and I think we should vote it down.

The question was then put on the election of a committee of nine on Labor Organizations, and it was carried.

The Secretary read the next item, "A Committee on Co-operation, of seven members."

DEL. SADLER (Wash.): What is the function of this committee?

THE CHAIRMAN: The function of this committee is to consider the co-operative movement and to report to this convention on the character and importance of the movement and the proper relations between the Socialist Party and the co-operative movement. Any further discussion?

DEL. BERGER: And also to make suggestions to this convention how to assist the co-operative movement. The Socialist movement in order to be successful, must not only help the trade union movement or rather the economic struggle, but must also back up the co-operative movement. That is another part of the co-operative commonwealth that we cannot neglect.

THE CHAIRMAN: The committee will bring in recommendations on that point that the title of the committee be amended, as it were.

DEL. HOGAN: What is your amendment, Com. Hogan?

DEL. HOGAN: Co-operative manufacturing.

DEL. BERGER: No, I object.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is that your amendment, Com. Hogan?

DEL. HOGAN: No, it is not my amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN: Very well. Any further discussion? Any objection to the appointment of that committee?

DEL. HOGAN: I simply wanted to suggest to the committee that I thought that ought to be done.

THE CHAIRMAN: The comrades will take the suggestion. Any objection to the appointment of this committee?

No objection was heard, and the rule was adopted.

THE CHAIRMAN: The next item, "A Committee on State and Municipal Provisions of seven members."

DEL. HOGAN: Any objection to the election of a Committee on State and Municipal Provisions?

DEL. KILPATRICK (N. J.): Moved that the committee be enlarged to nine.

DEL. BERGER accepted the amendment on behalf of the committee.

DEL. SMITH (Cal.): I want to know if this committee is to consider the question known as commission form of government.

DEL. BERGER: Yes.

There being no objection, the rule was adopted.

THE CHAIRMAN (N. J.): I would like to know whether there is a Committee on

Immigration provided for?

THE CHAIRMAN: The

Immigration was elected by the last party congress and will report at this convention.

Rule 8 was read by the Secretary a second time.

DEL. KATE SADLER (Wash.): I move to amend that no delegate shall speak twice unless by unanimous vote of his delegation.

THE CHAIRMAN: That would be unnecessary. By unanimous vote this delegation can do anything without motion.

DEL. TUCK (Cal.): I rise to move my motion to strike out "ten minutes" and substitute "five minutes."

DEL. BERGER: Com. Chairman and comrades, I am accustomed of being limited to a five-minute rule. The average man can say a great deal in five minutes, but the average Socialist orator cannot. And there are a good many men and women here who only have a chance once in four years, and a good many in two years. I tell you what happened in the state of Washington of proposed to make it ten minutes. I will be very glad to accept the five-minute rule, however, if it meets the wishes of this convention. Five minutes are plenty as far as I am concerned. I am simply wanting to give some of my comrades a chance.

DEL. MALEY (Wash.): I speak against the amendment for five minutes; not in behalf of the Socialist agitator, but in behalf of the comrades in this convention who must have a little time in which to voice their thoughts.

DEL. RAMP (Ore.): I want to accept the amendment. I think the amendment is to good but I want to offer an amendment to be the amendment, that a delegate a second time upon a motion, with the consent of this organization. (Seconded.)

I want to suggest to the delegates that at least five dollars for every minute, and \$25 worth of express your sentiments (Amplause.)

DEL. RINGLER (Pa.): I am in favor of the five-minute amendment. I know that absolutely a week-minute rule heretofore, adoption of the ten-minute rule heretofore, amendment to the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN: There is one before the house.

DEL. LEWIS: I have another amendment to it.

THE CHAIRMAN: A substitute for the whole? LEWIS: A substitute for the whole, that no delegate in any one of the

13

the delegates in a delegation from the State, and six of them are in harmony with the chairman Gets up in order to announce nine votes for the particular view for which the majority stands, and six have distinguished the three, and the delegates are not in old party politics. But we have the delegates to speak for themselves. And I rest my position on this. We want to have the absolute right to determine this vote exactly what terms we will accept the vote on.

THE CHAIRMAN: In answer to the question, the chairman says that the delegates in a delegation from the State, and six of them are in harmony with the chairman Gets up in order to announce nine votes for the particular view for which the majority stands, and six have distinguished the three, and the delegates are not in old party politics. But we have the delegates to speak for themselves. And I rest my position on this. We want to have the absolute right to determine this vote exactly what terms we will accept the vote on.

delegates of such states are not in agreement upon the matter up for vote." The motion of Delegate Goebel was seconded.

DEL. EDWARDS (Tex.): "I move to amend that by adding: 'Providing that where an instruction has been given by the legislature on any particular question the instruction of that particular question shall be obeyed.'"

THE CHAIRMAN: "The amendment is in order. There are no other amendments. Unless there should have been any other instruction should have been given."

The amendment was duly seconded, DEL. BEGGIS.

cause I thought it was unnecessary, after I heard the original of Comrade Goebel be-

We have had the same explanation of our very necessary. Goebel's amendment is

the right of every delegate to vote as he pleases. But the chairman's explanation sets

But since the result was whatever the spokesman for the delegation. He announced the result was.

...the chairman construes the rule differently I believe it is necessary to have an amendment of this kind in the other hand.

amendment to the amendment offered by the delegate from Texas. That

THE CHAIRMAN: Thinks it is

CHURCH: We have just voted something down, and now you want to put it in through the back door.

...will reject the amendment and accept the original amendment offered by Comrade [Name] of New Jersey.

EL. BERTLYN (II.): The amendment
 erred by Comrade Goebel I feel.

...a socialist organization. I
here today representing the state of
ois—not Barney Berlyn's views
here in a remote

representative capacity: I think that my state chooses to direct its duty toward the

here; or if I could not do that I
d refuse to act for them. Now let us
stand this proposition.

convention. This is not a convention. This is not a Republic. We are here in a gathering of the people of the United States.

...a delegate cap-
...the principles and wishes
...If our constituents
...special subject
...constituency.

...of the delegation instructed us it
member of that delegation to see that
structions of his state in his
capacity re

... if he violates those
 tions, when he goes home he should
 CHAIRMAN. ...

so far as the time fixed for our
the hour of adjournment has
received, and the

convention then adjourned until 2 30

ON.

upon the rules we shall have to permanent officers; and we shall e to nominate fourteen with

with 117 members on those committees. Every state will nominate, comrades, if we discuss

those nominations today when we have the ballots printed over night, and we shall be able to vote upon the nominees tomorrow morning. If we don't do that we lose an entire day. So we have to dispose of our business with great dispatch. Please bear that in mind.

Rule 12 is now before you. The secretary will read Rule 12; and then the amendment will read Rule 12; and then the amendment and then the amendment to the amendment.

THE SECRETARY: The amendment offered by Delegate Goebel of New Jersey is that the vote of delegates of that state be as a unit where the delegates of that state are not in agreement on the matter up for consideration. The amendment is offered by Delegate Edwards of Texas as this: "Unless instructed to vote as a unit by a referendum vote of their state."

DEB. EDWARDS: I wish to make a correction. As read it refers only to special instructions, and not as an instruction to vote as a unit. I will read the motion to amend: "Provided that where action on a particular question has been given by referendum the instruction has been given by the instruction on a particular question the instruction shall be obeyed."

Speaking to that I wish to say that I am heartily in favor of the motion of Com. Goebel which will prevent tying up a delegation by the unit rule where a state delegation is divided. But where a state delegation is expressed by referendum vote that if a particular question is submitted to the delegate it is unwilling to abide by the decision of the state and that if that particular question has not been a delegation vote, that it should not be a delegation vote, that an instruction should be obeyed.

THE CHAIRMAN: The secretary will read the amendment as corrected.

THE SECRETARY: "Provided that where an instruction has been given by referendum vote on any particular question the instructions on that particular question shall be obeyed."

DEB. HARRISMAN (Cal.): This entire question has arisen over instructions given by the state of California. I presume therefore it is our duty to inform the delegates here of the facts. The facts are that our state secretary wrote a resolution upon matters of general policy, generally consistent with the policy adopted in the state of California. This proposition, all of in fact, would be looked upon favorably by the membership of that state. After having written his resolution he sent it to Local Vista and had it initiated and passed out through the state without submitting it to the State Committee. We were fore instructed on all the proposed by the gained in the result of the general secretary, and a instruction was given an instructions that read to the convention, thus I want you know precisely what that you may know precisely what that situation is, and what it is that you are acting upon.

"And be it further resolved that it foregoing shall be and constitute instructions by the membership of California, its state delegation, May 12, 1912; that all questions said delegation shall vote as a unit, and that on all matters where a instructed a majority vote of the delegates shall determine the attitude of the delegation."

Now that is what we are up against; and that is what you people are acting upon. That is the source of the resolution.

DEL. WRIGHT (Cal.): This convention is not responsible for the instructions given to the California delegation; they should formulate their own method of voting as a unit; and it is not essential the delegates should agree upon a platform or shape our rules of order. I am sorry to see you presented in this state.

THEL. GALLIMAN: Do you rise to a point of order?

DEL. WRIGHT: I am speaking to the resolution.

DEL. MERRICK: It seems to me to be very clear at this time that this matter is one of importance to this party as a matter of precedent that you are going to set for future conventions. Comrade Goebel's proposition is perfectly clear. There can be no question for a minute but what any good Socialist who comes instructed by his state should live up to those instructions. But to claim for one minute that on matters where there is no instruction the delegation should hold a caucus and bind and throttle the members of that delegation in all probability in violation of the will of the people is certainly contrary to the policy in the state is certainly contrary to the historic ethics and principles of Socialism. There has been a matter of votes of great importance arisen since that vote was taken in the state of Cal. that the delegates, if they could as a national look with favor on any practice that smacks of Republicanism or Democracy by bringing in a gag unit rule here.

I say comrades, that we should stand by instructions given on any specific proposition; but the Socialist Party shall say whether any unsocialistic practice shall prevail in this National Convention of the party; and whether any state delegation shall be allowed to proceed in a way that is in violation of fundamental socialist principles.

I think it is an unfair proposition in any sense that if a state has instructed its delegates on any important question that it has also the right and power to say on those delegates at the coming session something of importance about except as which they cannot know that the majority of the delegation shall have the power to override and silence the minority on that uninstructed matter. It seems to me that you are setting a dangerous precedent derived from Republican and Democratic politics, and having no proper place in a Socialist organization.

DEL. SOLOMON (N.Y.) I think it shouldn't be made possible where a delegation has been instructed on a particular subject to cast the entire vote of that delegation, no matter how the individual delegates may feel about the matter. That is not the business of this National convention. And so far as the delegates carrying out their instructions from their state on any citizen proposition, if any delegate who consents disrepairs the instructions of his state, it is for the state organization to settle that question and it is not for us to do it. Just as if when he has been selected to settle state as a delegate to this convention representing that state he consents to give instructions how the state wishes him to vote on a particular question he should follow those instructions; without if he does not he should be dealt with by his state. But the delegates cannot not by any means pass a unit rule whereby a chairman of a delegation will cast a solid vote of the delegates from

particular state perspective of the wishes of the individual delegates.

I believe the proposition by Goebel was absolutely superfluous. At no time was the purpose to have the chairman of the convention cast the entire vote of the delegates. On the wishes of the delegates, the chairman of the convention would make it possible in a caucus for the majority of the delegates to make a motion to amend the constitution. The motion would be made in the state for the delegates to vote on the amendment. The motion would be made in the state for the delegates to vote on the amendment. The motion would be made in the state for the delegates to vote on the amendment.

DEL. COLLINS (Calo.): I do not believe democratic control of the party move for the state or any to say that if any state—my and then it is not done, it is the will of the majority and not the will of the minority. If the majority of the members of the party in a state decide that I shall cast my vote in a delegation, and as a whole, why that is the instruction of the majority of the delegates. If it came from some subdivision of the party in that state, that is the will of that state. When it comes to a clear majority of the state on a straight referendum, if you are to have state autonomy at all then you must stand back of the vote at all then you let them decide whether they wish their delegates at this convention to cast their votes as one unit. If they have more faith in the opinion of a majority of their delegation than they have in the individual right of a minority, that is their right. If they wish the majority of the state delegation to rule the delegation of the state, that is their right. If they wish the majority of the state delegation to rule the delegation of the state, that is their right.

DEL. ZITTE (Ohio): I believe that this is a question of procedure and as the convenience of this convention is opposed to a certain delegation, I think it will be well for the convention to subject its convenience to that with by tabling this whole matter. And there I move as a substitute that we table the original rule and all the amendments that have been offered.

SEVERAL DELEGATES: Second the motion.

THE CHAIRMAN: The motion to table is always in order and is not debatable. Under Robert's Rules of Order—and that is what we are acting under—if a motion is tabled it carries with it all the subsidiary rules.

THE CHAIRMAN: Not all the rules; that I am in favor of the amendment to the amendment. I take it that we are a body today, not at all an anti-body, and that they have come here for a purpose. Those instructions are on matters that they have not had an opportunity to consider. The rule that the majority of that state has laid down by its votes must be our referendum powers of the state that in establishing a bad precedent. It would be establishing a bad precedent. If you vote

down the amendment to the amendment it leaves you establishing a proposition here that takes entirely away from the states the right to instruct their delegates, according to the wishes of the party body, and we want to state plainly expressed, now we not? We know there are differences of opinion among delegates from a state, and it is precisely because there are differences of opinion that delegates are most frequently instructed on certain definite propositions. Now do you say that we, delegates in convention assembled, must override the action and decree of the whole membership of the state? If you do vote down the amendment, that is the whole in democracy. If you believe in the principle of the referendum, and the right of the membership to express themselves, and the moral duty of the delegates, and those instructions then vote for the amendment to the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN: The previous question having been moved and seconded was carried.

THE CHAIRMAN: The previous question having been moved and seconded was carried.

THE CHAIRMAN: The previous question having been moved and seconded was carried.

THE CHAIRMAN: The question comes to close under our rules? I have the right to close.

DEL. BERGER (No.): Some one has the right to close.

DEL. GOEBEL: I have the right under that rule.

THE CHAIRMAN: The chair is wrong. Speak on, George.

DEL. S. SADIEN (Wash.): I believe the chair holds. That rule has been adopted.

DEL. GOEBEL: I want to say that I do not give the snap of my finger for California or any other state in this matter. We are here representing the national Socialist Party, the Socialist Party of America. Comrade Kaplan says that we are perfectly willing to concede the point, am I tried to be established here? What method by which crooked politicians in various states have been able to trade off the vote of entire state delegations to others paying like powers for favors not used to them, and the precedent that we shall establish here will be that it will not go that way in the Socialist Party.

Comrade Kaplan's amendment does not alter my original motion one iota, except to make it more clear. What he proposes is a referendum of the state to vote a certain way on a certain proposition, on the question, it is my business to obey those plain instructions. But that is not the point here. The party in California have instructed their delegates how they shall vote

on certain specific questions and then on top of that added another referendum which they are directed to vote on a unit on the matters about which they have not been specifically instructed by their state. That means, if they have that if ten of them as I think they have, that if ten of them who think a certain thing even though the proposition get together and know nothing of the membership of that state know nothing of the members of that particular question, yet if the ten of them agree that way a certain one representing that ten will stand up and cast the vote that is what I do not believe in. That is Socialism, then it is Socialism. If that is Socialism, then it is Socialism. If that is Socialism, then it is Socialism.

DEL. GAYLORD (Wis.): I do. DEL. GAYLORD (Wis.): I do. DEL. GAYLORD (Wis.): I do.

DEL. GAYLORD (Wis.): I do. DEL. GAYLORD (Wis.): I do. DEL. GAYLORD (Wis.): I do.

DEL. GAYLORD (Wis.): I do. DEL. GAYLORD (Wis.): I do. DEL. GAYLORD (Wis.): I do.

DEL. GAYLORD (Wis.): I do. DEL. GAYLORD (Wis.): I do. DEL. GAYLORD (Wis.): I do.

DEL. GAYLORD (Wis.): I do. DEL. GAYLORD (Wis.): I do. DEL. GAYLORD (Wis.): I do.

DEL. GAYLORD (Wis.): I do. DEL. GAYLORD (Wis.): I do. DEL. GAYLORD (Wis.): I do.

DEL. GAYLORD (Wis.): I do. DEL. GAYLORD (Wis.): I do. DEL. GAYLORD (Wis.): I do.

DEL. GAYLORD (Wis.): I do. DEL. GAYLORD (Wis.): I do. DEL. GAYLORD (Wis.): I do.

DEL. GAYLORD (Wis.): I do. DEL. GAYLORD (Wis.): I do. DEL. GAYLORD (Wis.): I do.

DEL. GAYLORD (Wis.): I do. DEL. GAYLORD (Wis.): I do. DEL. GAYLORD (Wis.): I do.

DEL. GAYLORD (Wis.): I do. DEL. GAYLORD (Wis.): I do. DEL. GAYLORD (Wis.): I do.

DEL. GAYLORD (Wis.): I do. DEL. GAYLORD (Wis.): I do. DEL. GAYLORD (Wis.): I do.

DEL. GAYLORD (Wis.): I do. DEL. GAYLORD (Wis.): I do. DEL. GAYLORD (Wis.): I do.

DEL. GAYLORD (Wis.): I do. DEL. GAYLORD (Wis.): I do. DEL. GAYLORD (Wis.): I do.

DEL. GAYLORD (Wis.): I do. DEL. GAYLORD (Wis.): I do. DEL. GAYLORD (Wis.): I do.

DEL. GAYLORD (Wis.): I do. DEL. GAYLORD (Wis.): I do. DEL. GAYLORD (Wis.): I do.

those states have been able to vote of entire state delegations to them, like powers for favors promised to them. And the precedent that we establish here will be that it will be so that way in the Socialist Party. I think my original motion one lota except is more clear. What he proposes is clear. If I have been instructed by a certain proposition, on the trades question, or the immigration question, it is my business to obey those plain actions. But that is not the point the party in California.

people gathered. How is that? That says the universe. How does it say that so good as yours does. I could say louder, too, if I wanted to. What's use?

But there is a more serious matter here and that is the right of the membership as a whole to instruct its delegates and to have a state to instruct the entire convention all actions and as to the national convention their action in the national right to and this convention has no right to challenge that right. I challenge the right to do it. I challenge the convention to make that rule, especially of California to make these instructions of California to make these instructions about California. I don't care particularly about the specific instructions of California.

of its own state of such a rule. the absence of such a rule. DEL. KATIE SADLER (Wash.): I move to strike out Rule 13. The motion was duly seconded. On vote it was declared lost. Rule 13 as read was then adopted.

RULE 14.

"Such members of the National Executive Committee who are not delegates, nor the National Secretary, shall have a vote in the convention. This provision and no vote applies to members of the Women's National Committee." THE CHAIRMAN: Is there any objection to the adoption of this rule? The rule is adopted.

THE CHAIRMAN: The vote is now in order. The Secretary will now read the original rule, the amendment and the amendment to the amendment.

DEL. HOGAN (Ark.): I claim my right to speak.

THE CHAIRMAN: The main question is between Friday and Wednesday. The original rule is that we adjourn Friday, May 17th, at 3 o'clock. The amendment is that we adjourn Wednesday, May 15th, instead. The amendment of Del. Hogan is that we add: "Provided that the platform shall have been adopted at that time."

THE CHAIRMAN: The question comes on the adoption of the amendment to the amendment provided that we shall adopt the platform before nominating candidates for President and Vice President.

A division having been called for the amendment to the amendment was lost by a vote of 90 Aye and 134 No.

THE CHAIRMAN: The vote now occurs on the substitution of Wednesday for Friday.

The amendment was defeated.

Rule 18 as reported by the committee was then adopted.

RULE 19.

"The convention shall adjourn not later than Saturday May 18th, at midnight."

DEL. RINGLER (Pa.): I move to amend by making it Friday night.

The motion was duly seconded.

An amendment was made and seconded.

DEL. SOLOMON: I move to table the whole matter.

The motion was duly seconded.

Direct of the motion.

DEL. HOGAN: That is the motion?

THE CHAIRMAN: Some delegates do not understand the motion, and the motion is that the rule proposed so that all amendments be tabled, that would mean that we have no rule as to the time of adjournment.

On division on the motion to table there was a tie vote of 112 for and 112 against.

THE CHAIRMAN: There being a tie vote the chair will decide against the motion to table.

The previous question was then called for.

DEL. BERGER (Wis.): Most of us have neither time nor money to stay here indefinitely. We rented this hall for one week only. So if you extend the business of the convention beyond Saturday night we shall have to hire another hall. I believe we can do the work of the party, all the work before this convention in the time suggested if we use a little common sense. Please help us to do the work of the party and don't take up unnecessary time with points of order and points of information and unnecessary discussion of unimportant matters.

DEL. SOLOMON: I proposed the motion to table. If we fix a definite time for the adjournment then the tendency will be to drag along until that time, whether we need to do so or not. It will prevent us getting through perhaps on Thursday evening. If we and that we can conclude our business by Thursday or Friday evening, then we should adjourn then, for no reason for making a definite time for adjournment, do not waste time by setting a definite limit for the adjournment. There we at ways adjourn six hours earlier than we expected.

THE CHAIRMAN: The motion is to adopt rule 19. The amendment offered by Ringler is that we adjourn Friday. The amendment to the amendment by Killinger is that no time be fixed for adjournment.

DEL. KILLINGER (N. J.): My motion was that this convention adjourn when it was over, this business.

THE CHAIRMAN: This amendment to the amendment is that this convention adjourn when it has concluded or completed its business.

A division being called for the amendment to the amendment was lost by a vote of Aye 55, No 145.

The amendment to the amendment was defeated by a vote of 55 to 145.

The amendment to substitute Friday for Saturday was put to a vote and lost.

The original motion, to adjourn not later than Saturday midnight, was then carried.

Rule 20 was then read by the Secretary.

THE CHAIRMAN: Any opposition or objection?

DEL. SOLOMON (N. Y.): When are we permanently organized?

THE CHAIRMAN: I suppose permanently organized means when we have elected a permanent chairman.

DEL. SOLOMON: I move an amendment that all speeches of welcome be postponed till after the election of committee.

DEL. SPARGO: I move as an amendment to the amendment that we hear speeches of welcome this day at 6 P. M. (Seconded.)

DEL. JACOBS (Wis.): Mr. Chairman, is it necessary, when a motion is offered, to always offer an amendment and then an amendment to an amendment, and then vote those down and then adopt the original proposition? Is it necessary to do that on every question? It seems to me we are wasting time. I want to get the information.

THE CHAIRMAN: The information of the chair is that so far it has been necessary. Whether it will be necessary in the future, God knows. (Laughter.)

DEL. SPARGO: I desire to state briefly the reason for making my proposition. The local comrades, I understand, have arranged for a demonstration for tonight, and it would seem particularly inappropriate, after we have held a public demonstration under their auspices, to be then welcomed in their behalf. I think we ought to have that much courtesy.

A vote was then taken on the amendment to hear the speeches of welcome at 5 o'clock this afternoon, and it was carried.

Rule 21 was then read and adopted without objection.

Rule 22 was also adopted without objection.

The Secretary then read rule 23.

DEL. WHEELER (Pa.): The Pennsylvania delegates think that four hours each should be allowed for the debate on the questions of immigration and agriculture, each side to choose a manager to divide the assignments of speakers, and all votes shall be taken without further debate. I move the adoption of the following amendment:

"That four hours each shall be allowed for debates on industrialism, immigration and agriculture. Each side shall choose a manager to divide the assignments of speakers, and all votes shall be taken without further debate. When all have spoken on the questions the vote shall be taken without further debate." (Seconded.)

DEL. GAYLORD (Wis.): I move to amend that by inserting instead of the

question of Industrialism, the report of the Committee on Labor Organizations and their relations to the Socialist Party." (Seconded.)

DEL. WILSON (Cal.): The delegates who were present at recent conventions of the Socialist Party will remember that on every discussion there were not simply two sides discussed, but many sides discussed. Those of you who remember the prolonged discussion, lasting for nearly two whole days, on the subject of immigration at the last congress which met in Chicago, will remember that we did not have only a majority report and a minority report, but we had a substitute motion, and then we had delegates from all over America giving their views on the subject of immigration, that could not be related either pro or con, either directly or indirectly, against or for one of these propositions. That may seem almost impossible, but it is a fact, and I say Mr. Chairman, that when these great, great every come up before us in this assembly, a right delegate on this floor ought to feel involved to express himself on the subject involved.

(Applause.) It is not simply two naked propositions that will be before us, or an amendment and an amendment to the amendment. It will be an effort on the part of the delegates not to be able to say views, and they may be for or against any exactly whether they are for or against any other particular person's views, but they ought to have a right to express their views. I think Mr. Chairman, that this kind of a division of time will be contrary to the best interests of the delegations.

(Applause.) I think that it will be important for these questions open to the chair and to the delegations, and if, at the conclusion of any great and serious debate, of a majority or minority report, then we have made provisions in the rules by which that debate may be closed, and we may extend that if we choose to two or three persons on conflicting sides. But on the main questions that shall arise before us here, at least seven or eight of these questions, there should be no limit to who stands where when he rises to speak. As near as we can, let us leave that to the care of the chair and to the honor of the delegates. I hope this management of time, divided into so-called two sides, will be voted entirely down. (Applause.)

DEL. O'REILLY (Ill.): There is another point to be considered. I recognize the importance of the questions involved at five give twelve hours to those questions at five hours a day we will find ourselves allotting two days and two nights to the discussion of those three questions. Now, they are all questions which have been thoroughly discussed in previous conventions and in papers and magazines, and which will be thoroughly discussed outside of the convention. I think almost every delegate has his views on this subject pretty well crystallized, or if he is working for the best interests of the delegation and working for the spot the delegates have been doing to some, think he will be willing to have the views voiced by one member's explanation of the views which he holds. I do not believe we should, at the beginning of our convention, pledge ourselves to spend two days and two-fifths of the time of our convention in considering three questions, and tie ourselves to any such pledge. (Applause.)

DEL. DAVIS (Pa.): If, after receiving the reports of the various committees, and if after the various reports are printed in the Socialist papers, the delegates come here undecided, all the time will not change your view one iota. I am going to vote, because I have tried to inform myself before coming, that much of the time of the convention into the hands of any two men, and five men. When it comes to the action of this convention on the question of immigration or the question of industrialism, I represent a branch that has over 800 members; I know their sentiments and I know my sentiments, and I want a voice as well as a vote on this question, and I am unalterably opposed to limiting this question to any one, two or half a dozen men. I want every Socialist here to express himself on this question and to have the courage of his convictions to vote them.

DEL. PEACH (Conn.): This motion now occupying the attention of the delegates, these questions is in conflict with the rule already adopted which governs the mode of procedure. By these rules that have been adopted, assigned a certain time. Therefore, it is out of order.

The Chairman held the point of order not well taken.

DEL. HOGAN (Ark.): I understand these three questions named are to be the most important that will come before this convention. When this work is done, we have determined the policy of the Socialist Party of America with respect to these three major part of our work. Now, I understand that in the congress of two years ago, which I had not the honor of attending, over two days were spent in the discussion of this question of immigration. Now, if it was necessary then, if it was a large question then, it must necessarily be as large now. Men who have read the report of the congress and have gone out and given the subject more than the ordinary attention since that time, have something to say here that I want to hear, and I am sure that when this convention passes upon this most important matter it ought to be as a result of our deliberations. And I hope, with Com. Wilson of California, that you will not limit the discussion here. You have already limited the day.

DEL. WHEELER (Pa.): I rise to speak and am sorry to hear that a speaker already said how many minutes a speaker may give to a subject. You have already in the rules hedged about as discussion of this character. Now, let us not leave a subject till we have thrashed it out completely. Let us not let it be left to the judgment of the chairman and the judgment of the delegates who, I am sure, are here for the purpose of acquiring the largest information before they vote.

The previous question was then ordered.

DEL. WHEELER (Pa.): I rise to speak and am sorry to hear that a speaker already said how many minutes a speaker may give to a subject. You have already in the rules hedged about as discussion of this character. Now, let us not leave a subject till we have thrashed it out completely. Let us not let it be left to the judgment of the chairman and the judgment of the delegates who, I am sure, are here for the purpose of acquiring the largest information before they vote.

The previous question was then ordered.

DEL. WHEELER (Pa.): I rise to speak and am sorry to hear that a speaker already said how many minutes a speaker may give to a subject. You have already in the rules hedged about as discussion of this character. Now, let us not leave a subject till we have thrashed it out completely. Let us not let it be left to the judgment of the chairman and the judgment of the delegates who, I am sure, are here for the purpose of acquiring the largest information before they vote.

The previous question was then ordered.

DEL. WHEELER (Pa.): I rise to speak and am sorry to hear that a speaker already said how many minutes a speaker may give to a subject. You have already in the rules hedged about as discussion of this character. Now, let us not leave a subject till we have thrashed it out completely. Let us not let it be left to the judgment of the chairman and the judgment of the delegates who, I am sure, are here for the purpose of acquiring the largest information before they vote.

The previous question was then ordered.

DEL. WHEELER (Pa.): I rise to speak and am sorry to hear that a speaker already said how many minutes a speaker may give to a subject. You have already in the rules hedged about as discussion of this character. Now, let us not leave a subject till we have thrashed it out completely. Let us not let it be left to the judgment of the chairman and the judgment of the delegates who, I am sure, are here for the purpose of acquiring the largest information before they vote.

The previous question was then ordered.

DEL. WHEELER (Pa.): I rise to speak and am sorry to hear that a speaker already said how many minutes a speaker may give to a subject. You have already in the rules hedged about as discussion of this character. Now, let us not leave a subject till we have thrashed it out completely. Let us not let it be left to the judgment of the chairman and the judgment of the delegates who, I am sure, are here for the purpose of acquiring the largest information before they vote.

The previous question was then ordered.

DEL. WHEELER (Pa.): I rise to speak and am sorry to hear that a speaker already said how many minutes a speaker may give to a subject. You have already in the rules hedged about as discussion of this character. Now, let us not leave a subject till we have thrashed it out completely. Let us not let it be left to the judgment of the chairman and the judgment of the delegates who, I am sure, are here for the purpose of acquiring the largest information before they vote.

The previous question was then ordered.

DEL. WHEELER (Pa.): I rise to speak and am sorry to hear that a speaker already said how many minutes a speaker may give to a subject. You have already in the rules hedged about as discussion of this character. Now, let us not leave a subject till we have thrashed it out completely. Let us not let it be left to the judgment of the chairman and the judgment of the delegates who, I am sure, are here for the purpose of acquiring the largest information before they vote.

The previous question was then ordered.

DEL. WHEELER (Pa.): I rise to speak and am sorry to hear that a speaker already said how many minutes a speaker may give to a subject. You have already in the rules hedged about as discussion of this character. Now, let us not leave a subject till we have thrashed it out completely. Let us not let it be left to the judgment of the chairman and the judgment of the delegates who, I am sure, are here for the purpose of acquiring the largest information before they vote.

The previous question was then ordered.

DEL. WHEELER (Pa.): I rise to speak and am sorry to hear that a speaker already said how many minutes a speaker may give to a subject. You have already in the rules hedged about as discussion of this character. Now, let us not leave a subject till we have thrashed it out completely. Let us not let it be left to the judgment of the chairman and the judgment of the delegates who, I am sure, are here for the purpose of acquiring the largest information before they vote.

The previous question was then ordered.

DEL. WHEELER (Pa.): I rise to speak and am sorry to hear that a speaker already said how many minutes a speaker may give to a subject. You have already in the rules hedged about as discussion of this character. Now, let us not leave a subject till we have thrashed it out completely. Let us not let it be left to the judgment of the chairman and the judgment of the delegates who, I am sure, are here for the purpose of acquiring the largest information before they vote.

The previous question was then ordered.

DEL. WHEELER (Pa.): I rise to speak and am sorry to hear that a speaker already said how many minutes a speaker may give to a subject. You have already in the rules hedged about as discussion of this character. Now, let us not leave a subject till we have thrashed it out completely. Let us not let it be left to the judgment of the chairman and the judgment of the delegates who, I am sure, are here for the purpose of acquiring the largest information before they vote.

The previous question was then ordered.

DEL. WHEELER (Pa.): I rise to speak and am sorry to hear that a speaker already said how many minutes a speaker may give to a subject. You have already in the rules hedged about as discussion of this character. Now, let us not leave a subject till we have thrashed it out completely. Let us not let it be left to the judgment of the chairman and the judgment of the delegates who, I am sure, are here for the purpose of acquiring the largest information before they vote.

The previous question was then ordered.

DEL. WHEELER (Pa.): I rise to speak and am sorry to hear that a speaker already said how many minutes a speaker may give to a subject. You have already in the rules hedged about as discussion of this character. Now, let us not leave a subject till we have thrashed it out completely. Let us not let it be left to the judgment of the chairman and the judgment of the delegates who, I am sure, are here for the purpose of acquiring the largest information before they vote.

The previous question was then ordered.

DEL. WHEELER (Pa.): I rise to speak and am sorry to hear that a speaker already said how many minutes a speaker may give to a subject. You have already in the rules hedged about as discussion of this character. Now, let us not leave a subject till we have thrashed it out completely. Let us not let it be left to the judgment of the chairman and the judgment of the delegates who, I am sure, are here for the purpose of acquiring the largest information before they vote.

The previous question was then ordered.

DEL. WHEELER (Pa.): I rise to speak and am sorry to hear that a speaker already said how many minutes a speaker may give to a subject. You have already in the rules hedged about as discussion of this character. Now, let us not leave a subject till we have thrashed it out completely. Let us not let it be left to the judgment of the chairman and the judgment of the delegates who, I am sure, are here for the purpose of acquiring the largest information before they vote.

The previous question was then ordered.

DEL. WHEELER (Pa.): I rise to speak and am sorry to hear that a speaker already said how many minutes a speaker may give to a subject. You have already in the rules hedged about as discussion of this character. Now, let us not leave a subject till we have thrashed it out completely. Let us not let it be left to the judgment of the chairman and the judgment of the delegates who, I am sure, are here for the purpose of acquiring the largest information before they vote.

The previous question was then ordered.

DEL. WHEELER (Pa.): I rise to speak and am sorry to hear that a speaker already said how many minutes a speaker may give to a subject. You have already in the rules hedged about as discussion of this character. Now, let us not leave a subject till we have thrashed it out completely. Let us not let it be left to the judgment of the chairman and the judgment of the delegates who, I am sure, are here for the purpose of acquiring the largest information before they vote.

The previous question was then ordered.

DEL. WHEELER (Pa.): I rise to speak and am sorry to hear that a speaker already said how many minutes a speaker may give to a subject. You have already in the rules hedged about as discussion of this character. Now, let us not leave a subject till we have thrashed it out completely. Let us not let it be left to the judgment of the chairman and the judgment of the delegates who, I am sure, are here for the purpose of acquiring the largest information before they vote.

The previous question was then ordered.

DEL. WHEELER (Pa.): I rise to speak and am sorry to hear that a speaker already said how many minutes a speaker may give to a subject. You have already in the rules hedged about as discussion of this character. Now, let us not leave a subject till we have thrashed it out completely. Let us not let it be left to the judgment of the chairman and the judgment of the delegates who, I am sure, are here for the purpose of acquiring the largest information before they vote.

The previous question was then ordered.

DEL. WHEELER (Pa.): I rise to speak and am sorry to hear that a speaker already said how many minutes a speaker may give to a subject. You have already in the rules hedged about as discussion of this character. Now, let us not leave a subject till we have thrashed it out completely. Let us not let it be left to the judgment of the chairman and the judgment of the delegates who, I am sure, are here for the purpose of acquiring the largest information before they vote.

The previous question was then ordered.

DEL. WHEELER (Pa.): I rise to speak and am sorry to hear that a speaker already said how many minutes a speaker may give to a subject. You have already in the rules hedged about as discussion of this character. Now, let us not leave a subject till we have thrashed it out completely. Let us not let it be left to the judgment of the chairman and the judgment of the delegates who, I am sure, are here for the purpose of acquiring the largest information before they vote.

The previous question was then ordered.

DEL. WHEELER (Pa.): I rise to speak and am sorry to hear that a speaker already said how many minutes a speaker may give to a subject. You have already in the rules hedged about as discussion of this character. Now, let us not leave a subject till we have thrashed it out completely. Let us not let it be left to the judgment of the chairman and the judgment of the delegates who, I am sure, are here for the purpose of acquiring the largest information before they vote.

The previous question was then ordered.

DEL. WHEELER (Pa.): I rise to speak and am sorry to hear that a speaker already said how many minutes a speaker may give to a subject. You have already in the rules hedged about as discussion of this character. Now, let us not leave a subject till we have thrashed it out completely. Let us not let it be left to the judgment of the chairman and the judgment of the delegates who, I am sure, are here for the purpose of acquiring the largest information before they vote.

The previous question was then ordered.

DEL. WHEELER (Pa.): I rise to speak and am sorry to hear that a speaker already said how many minutes a speaker may give to a subject. You have already in the rules hedged about as discussion of this character. Now, let us not leave a subject till we have thrashed it out completely. Let us not let it be left to the judgment of the chairman and the judgment of the delegates who, I am sure, are here for the purpose of acquiring the largest information before they vote.

The previous question was then ordered.

DEL. WHEELER (Pa.): I rise to speak and am sorry to hear that a speaker already said how many minutes a speaker may give to a subject. You have already in the rules hedged about as discussion of this character. Now, let us not leave a subject till we have thrashed it out completely. Let us not let it be left to the judgment of the chairman and the judgment of the delegates who, I am sure, are here for the purpose of acquiring the largest information before they vote.

The previous question was then ordered.

DEL. WHEELER (Pa.): I rise to speak and am sorry to hear that a speaker already said how many minutes a speaker may give to a subject. You have already in the rules hedged about as discussion of this character. Now, let us not leave a subject till we have thrashed it out completely. Let us not let it be left to the judgment of the chairman and the judgment of the delegates who, I am sure, are here for the purpose of acquiring the largest information before they vote.

The previous question was then ordered.

DEL. WHEELER (Pa.): I rise to speak and am sorry to hear that a speaker already said how many minutes a speaker may give to a subject. You have already in the rules hedged about as discussion of this character. Now, let us not leave a subject till we have thrashed it out completely. Let us not let it be left to the judgment of the chairman and the judgment of the delegates who, I am sure, are here for the purpose of acquiring the largest information before they vote.

The previous question was then ordered.

DEL. WHEELER (Pa.): I rise to speak and am sorry to hear that a speaker already said how many minutes a speaker may give to a subject. You have already in the rules hedged about as discussion of this character. Now, let us not leave a subject till we have thrashed it out completely. Let us not let it be left to the judgment of the chairman and the judgment of the delegates who, I am sure, are here for the purpose of acquiring the largest information before they vote.

The previous question was then ordered.

DEL. WHEELER (Pa.): I rise to speak and am sorry to hear that a speaker already said how many minutes a speaker may give to a subject. You have already in the rules hedged about as discussion of this character. Now, let us not leave a subject till we have thrashed it out completely. Let us not let it be left to the judgment of the chairman and the judgment of the delegates who, I am sure, are here for the purpose of acquiring the largest information before they vote.

The previous question was then ordered.

DEL. WHEELER (Pa.): I rise to speak and am sorry to hear that a speaker already said how many minutes a speaker may give to a subject. You have already in the rules hedged about as discussion of this character. Now, let us not leave a subject till we have thrashed it out completely. Let us not let it be left to the judgment of the chairman and the judgment of the delegates who, I am sure, are here for the purpose of acquiring the largest information before they vote.

The previous question was then ordered.

DEL. WHEELER (Pa.): I rise to speak and am sorry to hear that a speaker already said how many minutes a speaker may give to a subject. You have already in the rules hedged about as discussion of this character. Now, let us not leave a subject till we have thrashed it out completely. Let us not let it be left to the judgment of the chairman and the judgment of the delegates who, I am sure, are here for the purpose of acquiring the largest information before they vote.

The previous question was then ordered.

DEL. WHEELER (Pa.): I rise to speak and am sorry to hear that a speaker already said how many minutes a speaker may give to a subject. You have already in the rules hedged about as discussion of this character. Now, let us not leave a subject till we have thrashed it out completely. Let us not let it be left to the judgment of the chairman and the judgment of the delegates who, I am sure, are here for the purpose of acquiring the largest information before they vote.

The previous question was then ordered.

DEL. WHEELER (Pa.): I rise to speak and am sorry to hear that a speaker already said how many minutes a speaker may give to a subject. You have already in the rules hedged about as discussion of this character. Now, let us not leave a subject till we have thrashed it out completely. Let us not let it be left to the judgment of the chairman and the judgment of the delegates who, I am sure, are here for the purpose of acquiring the largest information before they vote.

The previous question was then ordered.

DEL. WHEELER (Pa.): I rise to speak and am sorry to hear that a speaker already said how many minutes a speaker may give to a subject. You have already in the rules hedged about as discussion of this character. Now, let us not leave a subject till we have thrashed it out completely. Let us not let it be left to the judgment of the chairman and the judgment of the delegates who, I am sure, are here for the purpose of acquiring the largest information before they vote.

The previous question was then ordered.

DEL. WHEELER (Pa.): I rise to speak and am sorry to hear that a speaker already said how many minutes a speaker may give to a subject. You have already in the rules hedged about as discussion of this character. Now, let us not leave a subject till we have thrashed it out completely. Let us not let it be left to the judgment of the chairman and the judgment of the delegates who, I am sure, are here for the purpose of acquiring the largest information before they vote.

The previous question was then ordered.

DEL. WHEELER (Pa.): I rise to speak and am sorry to hear that a speaker already said how many minutes a speaker may give to a subject. You have already in the rules hedged about as discussion of this character. Now, let us not leave a subject till we have thrashed it out completely. Let us not let it be left to the judgment of the chairman and the judgment of the delegates who, I am sure, are here for the purpose of acquiring the largest information before they vote.

The previous question was then ordered.

1

There were other delegates who were disappointed because they could not get here. I had them here. I bid them here.

Comrades, the statement was made from the floor of this very hall that in the year 1912 the great issue would be Socialism and the Socialists. That statement was made in this hall by that friend of labor, Mart Williams. That was his prophecy, and his prophecy is being fulfilled. We are in this convention, the largest convention that has ever assembled from the working class as a class-conscious political organization. There is no doubt in my mind that the Indianapolis papers and the Indianapolis reporters are surprised to see you. Because they have got it into their heads that as a rule Socialists are not very intelligent people. They are no doubt, surprised to see the high order of intelligence of our delegates here, and also to see how orderly they are. In Chicago, four years ago it was necessary for the Republicans to post all about their convention hall such notices as "Leave your valuables at the hotel." I think there are pickpockets in the crowd! There are no reason to doubt that there may be local detective here, but I positively know that their services are not required, and that their space is more valuable to the Socialist movement than their presence.

Therefore, comrades, in conclusion, I extend the welcome of the Marion County Local; and I wish to say that if the organization of Local Marion County is service to any of the delegates we are at your service. Our headquarters are open to you for anything, and will be of benefit or comfort to the delegates. We are here to serve you. I thank you, comrade chairman.

THE CHAETMAN.* On behalf of the convention we accept the key to the city of Indianapolis which you have placed in our hands. We wish to thank Local Marion County, represented by you, very heartily for the hospitality that you have extended and that is so extended and enjoyed and enjoyed by us all.

Comrades, Branch 175 of the Workmen's Circle has asked for the privilege of making us welcome on behalf of that local. We are ready to be welcomed by anyone representing the Workmen's Circle, and if he is here he will be heard.

We shall now proceed with the nominations of the various committees. If we get through with them today we shall save a whole day. We can have the ballots printed over night.

At this point a body of workmen, representing Workmen's Circle, Branch 176, came into the hall. Comrade J. Goodman, representing the Circle, was given the platform.

*Referring to an alleged motion by Local Marion County, instructing Comrade Ott to wear overalls.—[Ed.]

COMRADE GOODMAN: I am here from Workmen's Circle 176. It is an organization that extends all over the United States, and has 40,000 members. I am here to welcome you on behalf of our organization because our organization does not accept members who do not pledge themselves not to vote for candidates of the Republican and Democratic parties; and that they will not be scabs. While it is organized for the immediate material benefit of its members, it is also an organization that is doing all it can for the Socialist Party. I am here to welcome you to Indianapolis, because you are the people who are to bring peace and happiness to all the people of the United States. The people of the country cannot expect anything from the Republican and Democratic parties because they are organized for the benefit of a few. But you delegates here are representing all the men and women that work, the men and women who produce everything. Therefore, I welcome you in the name of my organization. I thank you. Nominations for committees were then made as follows:

NOMINATIONS FOR PLATFORM COMMITTEE.

Wilson (Cal.), Geffs (Colo.), Chert (Washington, D. C.), Hogan (Ark.), Conrad (Ila.), Henry (Ind.), Landersick (Ky.), Sharo (Vt.), Ricker (Kan.), Rosett (Md.), Carey (Mass.), McMaster (Mich.), Kaplan (Minn.), Vierling (Mo.), Duncan (Mont.), Lee (N. Y.), Russell (N. Y.), Moore (N. D.), Zitt (Ohio), Nagle (Okla.), Keese (Pa.), Alexander (Tex.), Berger (Wis.).

NOMINATIONS FOR CONSTITUTION COMMITTEE.

Richardson (Cal.), Flosten (Colo.), Peach (Conn.), Allen (Fla.), Motley (Ila.), Berlin (Ill.), Oneal (Ind.), Jacobson (Iowa), Brewer (Kan.), Latimer (Minn.), Garver (Mo.), Stegman (Ill.), Jacobs Hillmuth (N. Y.), Bowen (N. D.), Bartholomew (Ohio), Branstetter (Okla.), Bostrom (Wash.), Wheeler (Pa.), Williams (Pa.), Smith (Tex.), Burt (Utah), Barnes (Pa.), Waynick (Wash.), Hogan (Ark.), Carlson (Wyo.).

A DELIBERATE: A point of information. A delegate nominate more than one member of a committee? **THE CHAIRMAN:** The delegates from any state can make as many nominations as they wish, but when it comes to election only one from each state can be elected.

NOMINATIONS FOR COMMITTEE ON RESOLUTIONS.

Slayton (Pa.), Williams (Cal.), Collins (Colo.), Cohen Thompson (Wis.), Maley Spargo (Vt.), Taylor (Ill.), Rower (Wash.), Taylor (Ill.), Rower (Wash.), Morgan (Mich.), Killingsbeck (N. J.), Farrell (Ohio), Reed (R. I.), Rhodes (Ore.), Metten (Tex.), Wilson (Kan.), Tiller (N. D.), Duncan (Mont.), Wells (Cal.), Thomas (Wis.), Paulsen (Wyo.).

NOMINATIONS FOR COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS.

Gaffey (Ark.), Regun (Cal.), Troxel (Colo.), Brown (Iowa), Burke (N. H.), Miller (Nex.), Watkins (Minn.), Stewart (Ila.), Clifford (Ohio), Goazou (Pa.), Jones (N. J.), Spargo (Vt.), Endres (N. Y.), Hayes (Ohio), Irwin (Okla.), Bacon (Pa.), Lesour (N. D.), Thompson (Tex.), Cupples (Wash.), Aaltoen (Mich.).

At this point it was moved and seconded that the rules for the convention be suspended, and that the delegates remain in session until all the nominations for the committees have been completed. The motion was carried.

NOMINATIONS FOR COMMITTEE ON REPORTS OF NATIONAL OFFICERS.

Simons (Kan.), Wates (Ind.), Stahard (Kan.), England (Me.), Grant (Minn.), Pevsey (Ohio), Miller (Nex.), Duffy (N. Y.), Storck (Ohio), Sherman (Ore.), Young (Pa.), Anna Cohen (Pa.), Ricker (Kan.).

NOMINATIONS FOR COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS.

DEL. GATYORD: What is the meaning of this committee? **THE CHAIRMAN:** The chair assumes that that committee reports on the progress of the Socialist Party abroad and our relations with the parties abroad. The following delegates were then nominated for the Committee on International Relations: (—) Hillquit (N. Y.), Haemer (Ill.), Simons (Kan.), Spargo (Vt.), Loann (N. Y.), Russell (N. Y.), Solomon (N. Y.), Bessemer (Ohio), Strickland (Ohio), Lauki (Minn.), Berger (Conn.), Wanhope (N. Y.), Reynolds (Ind.), Bennets (N. Y.), Barnes (Pa.).

NOMINATIONS FOR COMMITTEE ON PARTY PRESS.

The following delegates were nominated for the Committee on Party Press: Maynard (Cal.), Reynolds (Ind.), Kelly (Ill.), Kornegold* (—), Berdysky (Conn.), Harriman (Cal.), Sheffer (Ind.), Hickey (Tex.), Ingrams (Minn.), Wesley (Utah), Owen (Okla.), Maley (Wash.), Kraft (N. J.), Kennedy (Ill.), Malkiel (N. Y.), Lonard (N. Y.), Bachmann (Ohio), Clifford (Ohio), Ramp (Ore.), Erwin (Pa.), Spargo (Vt.), Wilson (Kan.), Lowe (Ill.), Morrow (Pa.), Rosett (Md.), Betall (Ill.), Cupples (Wash.), Barnes (Pa.), Jacobs (Wis.), Brewer (Kan.).

NOMINATIONS FOR PUBLICITY COMMITTEE.

Frank W. Wolf, Accepted.
E. P. Clark, Accepted.
Oxley (Neb.), Declined.
Ricker (Kan.), Declined.
C. J. Wright, Accepted.
Theimer (N. J.), Accepted.
Slayton (Pa.), Declined.
Hogan (Ark.), Declined.
Oneal (Ind.), Declined.
W. J. Ghent, Declined.
May Wood Simons, Declined.
John Spargo, Declined.

NOMINATIONS FOR AUDITING COMMITTEE.

Latimer (Minn.), Accepted.
Garrison (Ind.), Accepted.
White (Mass.), Declined.
Reynolds (Ind.), Declined.
J. A. Smith (Utah), Accepted.
Meitzen (Tex.), Declined.
Solomon (N. Y.), Declined.
Bostrom (Wash.), Declined.
Thompson (Wis.), Declined.
Fritz (Miss.), Accepted.

NOMINATIONS FOR COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN-SPEAKING ORGANIZATIONS.

Carolyn Lowe, Accepted.
Burdle (N. Y.), Accepted.

*Not a delegate.

Ameringer (Okla.), Declined.
Cohen (Mass.), Accepted.
Aaltoen (Mich.), Accepted.
Barnes (Pa.), Declined.
Goazou, Declined.
Lauki, Declined.
Malkiel (N. Y.), Declined.
Devold (Minn.), Accepted.
Jacobson (Minn.), Declined.
McCartan (Ohio), Accepted.
London (N. Y.), Declined.
Perrich (So. Slov.), Accepted.
J. E. Cohen (Pa.), Accepted.

NOMINATIONS FOR COMMITTEE ON LABOR ORGANIZATIONS AND THEIR RELATIONS TO THE SOCIALIST PARTY.

Merrick (Pa.), Accepted.
Harriman (Cal.), Accepted.
Troxell (Colo.), Accepted.
McLevy (Conn.), Accepted.
London (N. Y.), Declined.
Williams (Pa.), Accepted.
Richardson (Cal.), Declined.
Goebel (N. J.), Declined.
Rodriguez (Ill.), Accepted.
J. H. Maurer (Pa.), Accepted.
Strickland (Ohio), Accepted.
J. J. Jacobsen (Iowa), Declined.
Stallard (Kan.), Accepted.
Foley (Pa.), Declined.
Staun (Md.), Accepted.
White (Mass.), Accepted.
J. A. C. Menton (Mich.), Accepted.
Dempsey (S. D.), Accepted.
Branstetter (Okla.), Accepted.
Benjamin (Mo.), Accepted.
Smith (Mont.), Accepted.
Hickey (Tex.), Accepted.
Lewis (Ore.), Accepted.
Lee (N. Y.), Accepted.
Van Lear, Absent.
Clifford (Ohio), Accepted.
Osgrove (N. J.), Accepted.
Mex Hayes (Ohio), Not arrived.
Regun (Cal.), Declined.
Lawrence (Mass.), Accepted.
Ameringer (Okla.), Accepted.
Feld (N. Y.), Accepted.
Spargo (Tex.), Declined.
Sowards (Tex.), Accepted.
Goebel (N. J.), Declined.
Barn (Wash.), Declined.
Harriman (Minn.), Accepted.
Minkeln, Accepted.
Barnes (Pa.), Declined.

NOMINATIONS FOR COMMITTEE ON CO-OPERATIVES.

Lang (Iowa), Accepted.

Blane (Kan.), Declined.
Byrd (Tex.), Declined.
Stjohn (Ill.), Accepted.
Kaplan (Minn.), Declined.
Bruce (Pa.), Accepted.
Wright (Neb.), Declined.
Cory (Wash.), Accepted.
Lipscomb (Mo.), Accepted.
Stanley (Ila.), Declined.
Powell (Ohio), Accepted.
Lundgren (N. Y.), Accepted.
Kopp (N. Y.), Declined.
Gayford (Wis.), Accepted.
Cunibide (Okla.), Accepted.
Wells (Cal.), Accepted.

NOMINATIONS FOR COMMITTEE ON STATE AND MUNICIPAL PROGRAM.

Simons (N. Y.), Accepted.
May Wood Simons, Declined.
Williams (Tex.), Accepted.
Landersick (Ky.), Accepted.
Rhodes (Tex.), Declined.
McCrillis (Iowa), Accepted.
Noble (Tex.), Accepted.
Kennedy (Ill.), Accepted.
Jacobson (Minn.), Declined.
Lesneur (N. D.), Declined.
Grant (N. D.), Accepted.
Thompson (Wis.), Accepted.
Seidel (Wis.), Not present.
Kopp (N. J.), Accepted.
Doolley (Okla.), Accepted.
Berger (Conn.), Accepted.
Lockwood (Mich.), Accepted.
Anna Maley (Wash.), Absent.
Hauk (Del.), Accepted.
Maatila (Minn.), Accepted.
E. J. Brown (Wash.), Accepted.
Hoogerhyde (Mich.), Accepted.
Prevey (Ohio), Accepted.
Todd (Colo.), Accepted.
Downing (Cal.), Accepted.
Duncan (Mont.), Declined.
Parker (Pa.), Declined.

It was moved and seconded that the committees nominated be printed on the ballot and be distributed to the delegates, and when voted upon that the requisite number of each committee receiving the highest number of votes be declared elected, that the candidate receiving the highest number of votes be the chairman of the committee, and that when there are more than one candidate from a given state the candidate receiving the highest vote be chosen as a member of the committee.

The motion was seconded and carried. The convention then adjourned until Monday morning at 10 o'clock.

SECOND DAY'S SESSION.

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Hillquit.

The following delegates were nominated for the Chairman of the day: J. Mahlon Barnes (Pa.), James F. Carey (Mass.), James A. Schmidt (Utah), Sam Beardsley (Conn.), George Goebel (N. J.), G. H. Lockwood (Mich.), E. A. Greene (Tex.), Morris Hillquit (N. Y.), Charles T. Peach (Conn.), Arthur Leshneur (N. D.), J. Stitt Wilson (Cal.).

All of the above delegates declined the nomination excepting Barnes of Pennsylvania and Schmidt of Utah.

Upon the vote being taken it resulted, Barnes, 166; Schmidt, 50. Thereupon J. Mahlon Barnes of Pennsylvania was declared elected as the Chairman of the day.

The next order of business was the election of a Vice-Chairman.

DEL. MALKIEL: I move that the second name on the list for Chairman be chosen as the Vice-Chairman for the day.

The motion was seconded.

DEL. HILLQUIT: I desire to speak briefly against the motion.

THE CHAIRMAN: Will Comrade Schmidt accept the nomination?

DEL. SCHMIDT: No.

Nominations for Vice-Chairman are now in order. The following delegates were then nominated for the office of Vice-Chairman: J. G. Strickland (Ohio), George Goebel (N. J.), J. C. Edwards (Tex.), George Troxell (Cal.), N. A. Richardson (Cal.), John All the above nominees having declined the nomination, excepting Delegate Edwards, the latter was declared elected Vice-Chairman by acclamation.

We cannot hear DEL. COLLINS (Ohio). We cannot hear the proceedings at these side tables, and I move that the delegates seated under the balconies be allowed to remove their tables forthwith to the center of the room.

In favor of the amendment that another hall be procured will say aye. Those opposed say no. The ayes have it. The amendment is lost.

The original motion is that the delegates seated under the balconies be permitted to move to the center of the hall in the rear.

Is there a sergeant-at-arms?

A DELLEGATE: There has been none elected.

DEL. BESSEMER (Ohio): I move that the Chairman appoint six temporary sergeants-at-arms until we elect them regularly.

DEL. HOGAN: The election of sergeants-at-arms is in order now. Why not proceed with that?

The motion that the Chair appoint six temporary sergeants-at-arms was carried.

The following sergeants-at-arms: Comrades Newman, Hogan, Greene, White and Branstetter.

THE CHAIRMAN: The next thing in order is the roll call of delegates unless dispensed with.

DEL. SOLOMON (N. Y.): I move the roll call be dispensed with.

DEL. REILLY (N. J.): I suggest that while we may dispense with the roll call, that any delegates who were not here yesterday, and were not recorded, be given an opportunity to have their names recorded today.

The motion to dispense with the roll call was carried.

The following additional delegates were then reported present: Kruse, Strickland, Lantz, Zitt (Ohio); Ameringer (Pa.); Beery (Ohio); Harold (Tenn.); Va. Prosser (Pa.); Huston (W. Va.); Seidel (Wis.); Maxwell (Ill.); Orsini (Mass.); Baxter (La.); Cox (Ala.); Kriani (Ill.); Frank Prevey (Ohio); Hayes (Ohio).

On motion the reading of the minutes of the preceding day be postponed until the unfinished business is disposed of.

It was moved and seconded that the minutes of each day be printed and placed upon the desk of each delegate on the morning of the following day, and if any delegate finds anything objectionable in the minutes he can raise the objection. If no minutes are objected to they will stand adopted as printed.

The motion was carried.

THE CHAIRMAN: The motion having been adopted, the proper arrangements will be made by authority of this convention to have the minutes so printed and distributed.

THE SECRETARY: That means, of course, that the minutes of yesterday's session will be all these committees alphabetically and figures an awful job.

THE CHAIRMAN: The minutes of today's session will also be here tomorrow. The next order of business will be the report of the Committee on Credentials. There are no additional reports. The next

order is the unfinished business of yesterday.

COMRADE A. B. BAKER: There is a certain human element in getting printing done. We decided at yesterday's session to have the printed list of the nominations here; the copy was sent to the printers last night in plenty of time and the printers will not be here for an hour. That is the best we can do.

DEL. RICHARDSON (Cal.): A matter of personal privilege. We have come from all over the nation and there is an important question of railroad fares. The slips have been handed out. Are we to be allowed how to fill them out. Are we to be allowed our sleeper fares in coming to this convention? To bring the matter properly before the meeting, I move that regular sleeper fares be considered a part of the railway fare.

The motion was duly seconded.

DEL. SPARGO (Vt.): I move that the matter be referred to the National Executive Committee for consideration and report; otherwise we shall repeat the performance of 1904 and have four hours' discussion of this matter.

The amendment of Delegate Spargo was duly seconded.

DEL. GOLDBLUM (N. J.): There are delegates here who come from the Pacific Coast who ought to know whether they are going to receive a Pullman car fare.

THE SECRETARY: Does that motion mean that the committee shall report tomorrow?

THE CHAIRMAN: That they report to this convention, I suggest.

DEL. LOCKWOOD: We are here for business motion to refer to the National Executive Committee was carried on a division, 128 voting aye and 56 no.

DEL. REILLY: There is a matter on the election of committees. On one committee on which there were five nominees to be elected and we had only five shall not be more than one member on a committee from any one state. I found that we had only five nominees from the state of New Jersey. Therefore I didn't send the copy for that ballot to the printers. I was included on the committee. Some comrades made a motion that the Secretary should act, and that made me my state. I thought likely it would be possible to fill that publicly committee by so I take my name off of the convention.

THE CHAIRMAN: We have the names of the committee and we have the names of the committee. Shall we fill the committee by nominating one additional nominee?

The suggestion of the Chair was agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Nominations are in order.

DEL. MARGARET PREVEY (Ohio): I nominate Max Hayes of Ohio.

THE CHAIRMAN: If there are no further nominations the nominations will close. On motion the five nominees were declared the Committee on Publicity.

COMMUNICATIONS. Communications and telegrams conveying greetings to the convention were received from the following organizations: New York Young Peoples Socialist Federation.

Executive Committee Russian Branches
Socialist Party of the Northwestern States,
Societadnyy Iudish Socialist Branch,
Children of the South-east Socialist Sunday Schools, Cleveland, Ohio.
Third Ward Branch, Albany County, Pennsylvania.
Atlantic County Local, New Jersey.
Branch San Diego, California.
Jewish Daily Forward.
Socialist Agitation Bureau, New York.
United Hebrew Trades of New York.
Locals Gratton and Simpson, Taylor County, West Virginia.
Labor League of Boston, Mass.
Poplar Bluff Local, Mississippi, Ohio.
Socialist Sunday School, Cleveland, Ohio.
Jewish Socialist Territorialists, Philadelphia.
Jewish Socialist Party Conference, Chicago.

Naturalization League, Newark, N. J.
Central Committee Jewish Socialist Territorialist Labor Party of America.
Armenian Revolutionary Federation.
United Hungarian Socialist Federation of America.
Newark Young Peoples Socialist Federation.
Branch 434, Workmen's Circle, New Haven, Conn.
Branch 127, Workmen's Circle, Chicago, Ill.
Local Kings County, Socialist Party, New York.

THE CHAIRMAN: There are a number of letters which need reference to the committee which will be read and referred to the proper committees when elected.

National Executive Committee, Independent Workmen's Circle, Incorporated, Boston, Mass.
Referred to the Committee on Immigration.
Wichita Falls, Local 1149.
Referred to Committee on Immigration.
Communications from Swedish Local, West Concord, N. H., and from Slovak Socialist Section, Socialist Party of America.
Referred to the Resolutions Committee.

Communication from the Polish Section of the Socialist Party.
Referred to the Committee on Platform.
At the conclusion of the reading of the communication from the Swedish Local, West Concord, N. H., the following occurred:

DEL. BERLYN (Ill.): I have an idea that we are wasting time. That last communication is not a greeting. I think it is an attempt to influence the convention.

THE CHAIRMAN: Comrade Berlyn is right. The Chair announced that there were some congratulatory telegrams and letters, and that there were some others that would be referred to the committee. But there are only two divisions of the reading of letters and telegrams. Comrade Haywood addressed the convention as follows:

COM. HAYWOOD: I have a telegram from San Diego, Cal., that I would like to have read by the Secretary of the Convention.

A DELLEGATE: I would like to know whether it refers to a branch of the Socialist Party, or some other organization.

(Chas. of "Read it.") If there is no objection the Secretary will read it.

The Secretary then read the telegram referred to as follows:
"William D. Haywood,
Socialist Convention, Indianapolis.

"Am sending dispatch to Indianapolis, registered. Bring it up on floor of convention. Conditions critical here. Secure an appropriation from national organization to aid us. Present fight against anti-picketing ordinance, which also prevents all public meetings. Object suppression of Socialist and industrialist agitation. All radicals being deported. Employers seek to establish precedent which will allow deportation of all strikers in future. American Federation of Labor must take firm stand with us. Over 150 men still in jail; 100 T. Wednesday, and trade unionists arrested and assaulted by vigilantes and police. A group of police force them to leave city. Group of police personally attacks trade unionist, crippling him. Genuine funeral demonstration for Los Angeles, killed by police in riot on I. W. W. Hall. Unable to hold funeral here on account of police arranging funeral. Two men arrested while arranging funeral. Six men arrested. Socialist organizer held charged with conspiracy to murder. Grew out of strike during raid on hall. Socialist and union headquarters raided. Property taken."

DEL. CAREY (Mass.): I move that the matter be referred to the Executive Committee for immediate action.

DEL. WANHOPE (N. Y.): I second the motion.

DEL. SLOBODIN: I move to amend that they report here as soon as possible.

DEL. CAREY: Certainly.

DEL. FURMAN: I move to amend that they report not later than Wednesday at 3 o'clock.

The amendment was duly seconded. The motion, as amended, that the matter be referred to the Executive Committee for immediate action, with instructions to report to the convention as soon as possible, and not later than Wednesday at 3 o'clock, was carried.

DEL. FURMAN (N. Y.): I move that from now on that this mass of daily and weekly literature of the party be kept off the delegates' tables. We are utterly smothered by this literature, and are too busy to read it. Take it out and give it to the heathen on the street where it will do some good.

THE CHAIRMAN: The motion is that no more literature be laid upon the delegates' tables.

On motion duly seconded, the motion of Delegate Furman was laid on the table. DEL. HILLQUIT (N. Y.): It seems to me no other business before the house it seems it would be well to take up the regular reports from committees elected by the last National Congress of the party. There we have business ready for us and we need not waste any time.

DEL. CAREY (Mass.): I second the motion.

THE CHAIRMAN: You have heard the motion that the convention take up the consideration of the reports of the permanent committees. DEL. MALKIEL (N. Y.): I move as an amendment that when the ballots come we take a recess and proceed to the election consideration and proceed to the election of the various committees so that those committees may be able to go to work.

DEL. HILLQUIT: I accept the amendment. THE CHAIRMAN: It is understood then that when the ballots arrive the then order of business shall be set aside and we proceed to elect the committees. It is moved that we now take up the reports of standing committees.

DEL. SLAYTON (Pa.): I move to amend that the report of the Committee on Immigration be taken up first. On behalf of my comrades of the minority of the Committee on Immigration I ask the delegates that they will not carry this motion. We have held one meeting and it would be necessary for us to hold still another.

DEL. SLAYTON: In view of the statement of Delegate Sparzo I will withdraw my motion and if my second is willing, same committee that has been standing for two years; and it is not ready yet.

THE CHAIRMAN: That is not the point under discussion. The question is shall we take up this subject now.

DEL. STREIBEL (N. Y.): I move that we now take up the report of the Committee on Farmers' Programme.

COM. SIMONS: That committee is in the same position as the Committee on Immigration. We are not quite ready to report.

THE SECRETARY: The Committee on Vocational Education is the next.

DEL. STREIBEL: They are in a similar position. They have a report but only one of the committee is in this convention. The report, however, is here and can be read and acted upon.

THE CHAIRMAN: We shall then take up the report of the Committee on Education, Comrade Streibel, reporting.

DEL. LANFEBERCK (Ky.): I move that the reading of this report be dispensed with.

THE CHAIRMAN: The motion is that the reading be dispensed with. I might suggest that it does not follow that every report will be read because we read this one. We are competent from time to time to decide that matter.

DEL. GAYLORD: There is no good reason for taking the time of the convention in reading printed reports. The comrades are assumed to have had the time to read them. There is occasion for the discussion of the recommendations of a committee, or of the report of the committee. You will find the printed recommendations in the printed report. I suggest that Comrade Streibel read the recommendations; and then the matter can be brought definitely before us by a motion for their adoption.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you make that motion? DEL. GAYLORD: There is a motion now that the reading of the report be dispensed with. I move to amend that the recommendations only be read at this time.

DEL. HILLQUIT: I am opposed to the motion to dispense with the reading of this report. It is true that the printed reports have been sent out. It is not equally true, I venture to say, that every delegate has read all the reports attentively. Also the comrade reporting for a committee may desire to change parts of the report, or to elucidate the report as he reads it. The practice of acting upon printed reports upon the assumption that they have been read and that their contents are known, and understood by the delegates, that leads to that vicious practice that prevails in our legislative bodies where things are not disposed of intelligently; where things are read and done or assumed to be read and done, without intelligent thought as to what action they are taking. These reports are printed and distributed for the purpose of giving the delegates the opportunity to consider

them, but not for the purpose of eliminating the reading from the floor.

DEL. JACOBSEN (In.): A point of order. Under our rules adopted yesterday each chairman of a committee has twenty minutes in which to report. The chairman of a committee may employ his time in any way that he chooses. He can read the report or he can read the recommendations, or he can give the synopsis of the report. That is my point of order.

THE CHAIRMAN: The point of order is not well taken because the convention is always competent to decide whether it will have a report read or not; and that is what the convention is now doing. The motion is that the report be not read. The amendment is that the recommendations only be read as many as are in favor of having the recommendations only read will say aye.

The amendment to read the recommendations only was declared lost.

The motion to dispense with the reading of the report was then defeated.

DEL. STREIBEL: At the congress of the Socialist Party at Chicago, two years ago, the question was raised that all over the United States an agitation was in progress for the adoption of the vocational school system; that in different states different attitudes were taken by different locals; some favoring, some opposing the adoption of vocational schools. As this was a matter of great importance to the party it was brought before the Congress and this committee appointed, and the supposition was that this committee would be constituted of those who were capable of analyzing this subject, giving a thorough analysis to the vocational school, and the ideas upon which the theories in support of such schools were founded. But as to the report that is before you we never had a meeting; we never got together; and I am frank to say that this report may not be the very best that the convention or the party should have. Personally I should like to see it go back for further consideration. The report is here. As such I was willing to sign it to get the matter before this convention so that some further action could be taken on this important matter. I will read the report as we have it as written by the chairman of the committee.

DEL. GAYLORD: I move the adoption of the report. (Seconded.) DEL. M. W. SIMONS (Kas.): While I am thoroughly in accord with all the recommendations that have been made by this committee on vocational education, I think that several of the recommendations should have been much stronger, because as education is a matter of public service I think we should lay great emphasis on the statement that all education should come through the public schools. I think that we should say that instead of stating it as it is stated by the committee. Perhaps those who have not been about the country so as to know the real situation do not realize how tremendously important this question is becoming since we have been electing members of school boards in different parts of the United States. In Kansas we have men elected and in control of school boards. Two years ago the Woman's National Committee appointed a committee on this question and that committee has reported to the Woman's National Committee, and we are ready to bring in certain recommendations which we believe are a little more specific, especially

upon the industrial education of girls. That has not been touched upon here, and it is very general in its import. We have also some recommendations to bring in that we believe to be very specific upon the manner of handling this question of education as a whole. This committee dealt only with vocational education. We believe that the scope of such a committee should be enlarged. I would like very much, as we do not wish to lose our recommendations brought in at this time, I would like the delegates to remember in any discussion upon this matter that there is a second report coming in, you offer an amendment. The motion has been made to adopt the report.

DEL. M. W. SIMONS: I offer this amendment: That the convention defer action upon this report of the Committee on Vocational Education until this committee from the Woman's National Committee has reported.

The motion was seconded. DEL. OHLS (Mass.): I am opposed to these recommendations, No. 5 and No. 6. No. 5 demands that we oppose all legislation giving work to children which does not create social wealth. What do we mean by this lame statement. What we mean by this is economic wealth? Who is going to determine which work of children creates wealth and which creates economic wealth, which is industrial and which is social? It will be decided by the capitalist bodies that are in control and they will determine that any work done by children between five and fourteen years of age creates social wealth. Now, that you are dealing with here is education. Education should not be made work at all. So long as the capitalists decide that is social wealth this is detrimental to the working class. For that reason I move to strike out the fifth recommendation.

Now, as to the ninth recommendation, that is also vague. It says that we should insist upon emphasis being laid upon citizenship, manhood and womanhood. Those words have become really absurd. What does the committee mean by citizenship, by manhood and womanhood. We should improve on those words. What do you mean by prove on those words? If they mean that citizenship shall be determined by the U. S. C. A. that is entirely opposed to the idea of citizenship. We cannot trust the present state or any private organization to give one ideas of citizenship. We are the organization that must direct the young thinkers of the world. What is that our conception of the world? But if we simply mean by good citizenship that the public schools shall elect controlling bodies that will interpret it as their courts interpret what the world is, as necessary means or what violence is, or what necessary means in murder. We should instruct this committee to revise this recommendation and bring in one that will be very plain in its terms. I therefore move to strike out this recommendation.

The motion was duly seconded. DEL. ROEMER (O.): I move that action on the recommendation of this committee be deferred until we receive the report of the special committee from the Woman's National Committee on vocational education.

DEL. GOEBEL (N. J.): I didn't know that we had a woman's committee on education. The report is printed in full as Appendix B.—Editor.

THE CHAIRMAN: Perhaps I misunderstood the motion.

DEL. GOERREL: No. What has the women's committee to do with this question of education? They are butting into something that we had a special committee appointed to consider.

THE CHAIRMAN: I will ask Comrade

This is to give me the exact name of that Simons, or Del. Mr. W. SIMONS: The National Woman's Committee appointed a special committee to inquire into the question of industrial education for girls. I was asked to organize a committee to investigate that subject and reported to the Woman's Committee; and before their recommendations to the National Woman's Committee, or the National Board, I am opposed to wait-

During the report of the Woman's National Committee before acting upon this matter, I do not believe that this comes properly within the province of the Woman's Committee. Anything relating to the Socialist Sunday Schools might, in my judgment, this other matter does not. I have brought this up at this time because I believe that the Woman's National Committee are attempting to handle many things that do not come properly within their province. They have a special work to do and I think they should stick to it. We have a matter here which has been reported by another committee. Let us settle this and dispose of it for the settlement. And don't let us wait for the suggestions of another committee upon a matter that may be very closely connected with the subject before us (Okla.). So far as the

[illegible]

DEL. GIFFORDS (Colo.): If education does not come properly before the Woman's National Committee I should like to know what it does. I should like to know where there is in all this broad land who has a better right to handle the question of the education of our young people, and especially our young girls, than this same Woman's Committee? I should like to know where you would draw the line on that committee in regard to anything that concerns the interest of the young girls of the land? I object most strenuously to this matter being disposed of at this time. I object most strenuously to this report being adopted until all the Woman's National Committee has an opportunity to be heard. I am not a member of that committee but they have a right to be heard. If only they had a little time, and they are entitled to this courtesy. It is our right to demand, and you have no right to re-

Use it.
Del. MAURIEL (N. Y.): It is not a question of whether this committee or that committee should be the one to handle this question. It is a matter of this convention having before it all the information it can gather before it decides. Before you decide you want to know all you can on this subject. It is only a matter of

2. day or two. It makes no difference whether you decide this matter now. The fear here seems to be that the Woman's Committee will sway this convention. Don't fear. If you wait you simply get more information. Therefore I hope you will defer action on this.

DUT. SLAYTON (Pa.): You will re-

member that when Comrade Strebel read the report he stated that he would like to have the matter referred back for further consideration. Now the report that we may have from the Woman's Committee may have just the information that Comrade Strebel's committee lacked; intelligent advice us to take decisive and intelligent action. I add that as an additional point with all possible information before us the whole convention will be benefited. Del. Leib (N. Y.) will be benefited. the status of the matter at the present time. CHAIRMAN: It has been moved

THE CHAIRMAN: I hear cries from various sides and seconded that the recommendations of this committee be approved. It has been moved as an amendment that action upon this matter be deferred until we receive the report of the Woman's National Committee. The discussion now is on the motion to defer action.

[illegible]

I venture, I did not listen to all of it because I thought I had read the printed report. But most of what I have read the printed report. Then a number of you have done neither. There is another committee that has important information on the matter before us; and I think we should have important matter on that question to present; and that some comrade rises and moves the Woman's Committee; thus saying that the Woman's Committee should have nothing to do with this; we are going to vote now to defer your call is that if you vote now to defer your call off the opportunity to discuss this matter when we have nothing else before us and a

THE CHAIRMAN: The motion for this previous question has not been made yet. DEL. LEE: The previous question would carry with it the whole matter.

THE CHAIRMAN: No; only the motion to defer.

DEL. PEACH (Conn.): Had I been given the vote, I would have accepted the

the opportunity," said Comrade Simons, "the suggestion offered by Comrade Simons, realizing the great importance of this question of education. We have it in our state and it is a very important question. We have it in a form where it has been submitted by the Board of Education, and adopted in the law, that the schools shall be conducted part of the time and the children attend them; and

than the other part of the day they would spend in factories. We believe a recommendation of the committee on such a point as that is very important and should receive the earnest consideration of this convention. We from Connecticut believe that everything relating to education should re-

ceive the fullest consideration; because it is a practical thing actually confronting us. And I want to say that the question of the industrial education of women and girls is of just as much importance as the education of boys; and therefore I hope that the convention will accede to the request of Comrade Simons, so that we may get all the light possible on the matters contained in this report. It seems to me

DEL CASSIDY (N. Y.)—And she said that the report of Comrad Shims is agreed to will lead to a lot of confusion. The Committee on Education deals specifically with this question. They have considered the question, and have dealt with it in their report. During their deliberations the National Woman's Committee as well as any one else in the Socialist Party had the opportunity to present to that committee all the information they could gather on this question. They took up the

consideration of the matter, and two or three of the present reports seems to be a good idea. I do not know of any time and confusion. When subject are women, men more interested in them, the education of children of slaves? That is absolutely true. But I do not know the reasons why we should have two committees reporting. It is said that the two women are very much interested in their report of our Committee on Immigration. That is absolutely true. But that is no reason for separate reports. Then therefore, it is the Committee on the Relationship of the Party to the Labor Unions. They may bring in a separate report on that. Now, for the sake of logical and orderly procedure let us keep consistently and logically to one question so that it may be disposed of. I hope that the motion to defer action until the women report will be defeated.

DEL. ALEXANDER (Tex.) moved the previous question. (Succeeded.)

DEL. SLAYTON (Pa.): I am in favor of the previous question was then ordered.

committee. I do not favor the method by which they arrive at their conclusions. If we vote down this motion to defer and take final action on this report, we shall be taking action on something which contains some statements which I do not see how we could approve, unless we can have presented here the data concerning these things. In the report of the committee there are a lot of things that up to date I do not believe can be established to be true. There are positions taken, also that any one who has studied industrial education deeply knows are hardly tenable. To treat a question, it contains too much of moment for it to be disposed of off-hand here in a few minutes.

Another thing: the women should have a Socialist Party by all means, should have something to say with experience in this line, and I know that when it comes to the question of education in the public schools the women are the first and last word. They have it by right. They have been the main the educators of America, and the foremost educator in this country today is a woman. By all means this matter should be deferred and all possible information brought in here. If we pass upon this now I want to say that there are even things in this report that the Socialist Party cannot stand for, unless they can be established by the proof to be brought in here. We ought to have more information. We ought to have everything that the women can give us; as I said before they have the right to what it is.

A DELICATELY: Has not Comrade Goebel

DEL. GOEBEL: I was the original one to object to waiting. And whether I speak twice or not I think we all agree that parliamentary usage would give me the right to conclude.

Now I want to say to the women of this

Now I want to turn to the women of the Socialist Party and I want to say right here and now—that I refuse to allow the women to claim the children of this country any more than I claim them as a man. (Applause and laughter.) Let us understand each other about this. We have certain definite committees. We have the National Committee, we have the National Executive Committee, and then we have separate standing and special committees. The

have each some duty to perform in the movement they begin to influence on the duties of other committees. I do not want to see the loss of time, losses of money and confusion. That is the proposition here. Not whether we shall delay in this action until we hear from the Woman's Committee. There is a good reason for my objection. I understand that the women are prying in the stand that the women are prying in the recommendation on a party owned press. Doubtless they will bring in separate recommendations on other matters that are of general interest. We have a committee to deal with them. That is their special function.

Special propaganda work among the women and children would be a different matter. Let us understand each other. I am not flitting the Women's Committee. I want the national committee to do its business. I want the National Women's Committee to do its business; I want the Committee on Immigration and on Farmers' Programs to do their business. That is the only way in which we can have business done on a business basis.

DEL. BOEHM (O.): I should like to ask when the report of the Committee will be ready to report.

THE MR. W. SIMONS. They will be here at the beginning of the next session. We shall submit it as a part of our report.

The motion to defer action until after the report of the Woman's National Committee had been received, was then voted upon and declared carried.

CHISHAM BARNES: One word, for the benefit of our soap boxers who are going to distribute our philosophy. It is significant that here in this Socialist convention the first subject discussed before the convention is the question of education. I last saw a remarkable contrast to the subjects discussed in the republican and democratic conventions.

DEL. SPARGO: On behalf of the National Executive Committee I am ready to report on the question of Pullman car allowances to delegates.

The National Executive Committee had considered the matter of the payment of Pullman car fares of the delegates to the convention of the party referred to it by the convention. The National Executive

Committee having considered the matter from the standpoint of principle and the party's finances unanimously recommends to the convention that payment of traveling expenses be interpreted to include not only the bare railroad fare but the necessary conveniences. On behalf of the considerable Executive Committee I desire to state very briefly our reasons for that decision. In the first place I have no doubt at all that with very few exceptions, by an overwhelming majority of this convention, those of us who have traveled very long distances have come by way of a sleeper car. We have done this not merely for our own convenience, our desire for luxury, but we have done it in that way in order that we might be efficient and fit to do the work imposed upon us. Now, comrades, there is always the proposition of the man who says that as a working class party we should in all externals represent that working class. I don't care whether that is the case or not, but I think that all delegates should come with the tools of their craft, or whether it is expressed in the notion that we ought to come in day coaches or on the underground cars, if we possibly can do so. The fact is that is not the working class point of view at all. As a recognized class our supreme business is to build up that effective fighting machine of the working class, and men who come to the convention tired and outworn and weary are not

Chairman Barnes called the convention to order at 2:30 p. m.

LETITISH ORGANIZATIONS.

THE CHAIRMAN: Most of the foreign organizations have submitted in print copies of reports of their respective activities. The Executive Committee of the S. P. has submitted a report with sundry recommendations, and they ask that it be made part of the record and be included in minutes. On motion of Del. Goetzow it was so ordered.

COMMITTEE NOMINATIONS.

The roll of states was called for corrections in the printed list of nominations for the various committees. Several corrections and withdrawals were announced, and the delegates were requested to correct their copies of the ballot accordingly.

In consequence of declarations and absences, certain committees were left without enough nominees to equal the numbers out called by the rules, and the subject of nominations was reopened.

It was moved that the election of the Committee on Foreign Speaking Organizations be postponed until the other committees have been elected.

An amendment was offered that the election of the Auditing Committee take the same course.

*See Appendix O—Editor.

AFTERNOON SESSION.

In a position to make the best resistance to the forces of capitalism which can be made.

In the second place, I believe there was a time in this party when it was necessary for us to endure hardships; when our membership was small. There was a time in the history of this party when opposition to our position would have had a considerable basis of reason. But that time is happily passed forever.

Finally, comrades, this the twentieth century. And we of the working class demand for ourselves and our class all the advantages of the twentieth century.

Moved and seconded that the report of the National Executive Committee be adopted.

DEL. FLOATEEN (Colo.): I move to amend that wherever it is possible that they travel in tourist or second class sleepers, because the sleeping is just as good and costs just half as much.

DEL. BERGER (Wis.): I believe that those have the best right to ride in sleeping cars who build the sleeping cars.

The report of the National Executive Committee in regard to payment of Pullman car fares to delegates was then declared adopted.

The Chairman announced that the local committee had made arrangements for a group picture of the convention to be taken in front of the court house immediately after the adjournment.

The convention then adjourned.

placed on the desks of the delegates. Motion lost.

National Secretary Work announced the presence of A. V. Casselbury as an alternate from Georgia.

The Chairman called for additional nominations on committees, and the following were made:

AUDITING COMMITTEE.

Former nominations:

FRIZ (Miss).

TRINSON (Ind.).

WARD (Mo.).

Additional nominations:

PLUSE (Kans.).

BENNETS (N. Y.).

COMMITTEE ON REPORTS OF NATIONAL OFFICERS.

Del. Young (Pa.) withdrew his name, there being two nominees from Pennsylvania, and he nominated H. W. Houston of West Va.

COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS.

Additional nomination:

JOHN OHSEL (Mass.).

Del. Dunner moved that inasmuch as a sufficient number of nominations have been made for the Committee on International Relations, that the nominees constitute the committee. Seconded and carried.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN SPEAKING ORGANIZATIONS.

Del. Strebel (N. Y.) stated that the Committee on Foreign Speaking Organizations, under the rules, should consist of nine members, while only seven delegates had been nominated, and he moved to complete the nominations.

So ordered.

The following additional nominations were made:

REYNOLDS (Ind.)—declined.

REYNOLDS (N. Y.)—declined.

On motion of Del. Bessemer (Pa.) the rules were suspended and the seven nominees elected as the committee.

ELECTION OF COMMITTEES.

It was moved that the respective state delegations tabulate their vote for committees and present the report to the tell-off, accompanied by the individual ballots. An amendment was offered to strike out the words "accompanied by the individual ballots." The amendment was lost.

The original motion was then carried by a vote of 117 for, 110 against.

A recess was taken in order to permit delegates to prepare their ballots. The hour of five o'clock, the time for receiving resolutions, having arrived, fore votes were tabulated and reported and called that the rules be suspended during the tabulation of the votes and that the resolutions be received at the close of the session.

COMMUNICATIONS.

Communications were read from the following: Pittsburgh Young People's Socialist League. Referred to Resolutions Committee.

From Carl M. Sandberg, Chicago, relating to a plank in the platform. Referred to Platform Committee.

Resolution adopted by the 25th Ward Branch, Chicago, recommending a plank for the platform. Referred to the Platform Committee.

Resolution signed by Mrs. Charles Keeler, Secretary, in reference to Party press and its conduct. Referred to Press Committee.

Communication from Norfolk, Va., on the subject of party papers. Referred to Press Committee.

Communication from National Lettish Organization in reference to foreign speaking organizations. Referred to Committee on Foreign Speaking Organizations.

THE CHAIRMAN: There is a telegram of a controversial nature, assailing the right of a member of this convention to give a voice herein signed by a man. Is it the pleasure of the delegates that the communication be read?

The reading of the telegram was called for by several delegates.

THE CHAIRMAN: I stated that there is a telegram of a controversial nature attacking the rights of a member on the floor, and asked whether you desired it read or not.

A delegate moved that it be read. Seconded.

Another delegate suggested that there ought to be a consultation with the state delegation to which the attacked member belongs before the communication is read.

THE CHAIRMAN: Com. Floateen says with authority that it comes from his state.

A DELEGATE: Is this letter from a state convention?

THE CHAIRMAN: No; from a local branch.

A DELEGATE: What right have we to recognize this communication? These delegates are elected by the party.

DEL. BERLIN (Ill.): This would be establishing a precedent. I do not want to establish such a precedent. There are

5,000 locals, and if one should address this convention it would take up all the time.

THE CHAIRMAN: It is but fair to give you the further information that it assails the rights of one who is not a delegate, but one who by courtesy has been given a voice in this convention. I refer to a member of the National Executive Committee. He is not a delegate.

A delegate moved to refer to the Committee on Contested Seats.

THE CHAIRMAN: There is no such committee. The motion is that the communication be read.

DEL. MILLER (Nev.): I move as a substitute for the motion that the communication be referred to the delegation from Colorado.

DEL. CHADRON (Nev.): That would come in the form of an amendment.

DEL. MILLER: All right.

DEL. SPARGO: I move to lay that communication on the table. (Seconded.)

The question was put on the motion to lay on the table.

DEL. COLLINS (Colo.): A point of order on the taking of this vote. You have no right to table this communication till you know what your are tabling.

THE CHAIRMAN: That is no point of order.

The motion to table was then carried by a vote of 128 for, 50 against.

RESOLUTIONS.

The following resolutions were then presented and read and referred as respectively noted.

From William H. Prosser, Delegate from Pennsylvania on the liquor traffic. Referred to Platform Committee.

From C. L. Furman, Albert Polay and E. Lindgren, on behalf of Local Kings County, New York, on urging the national machinery of the party to promote private views on party tactics. Referred to the Committee on Constitution.

From Indiana, delegation on propaganda among the army, navy, etc. Referred to Committee on Resolutions.

Resolution submitted by Del. Walter Lanfester, of Kentucky, on extending financial aid to the party in the southern states.

THE CHAIRMAN: That will be referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

DEL. SPARGO: I move that the resolution be referred to the National Executive Committee. (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: It is referred to the Committee on Ways and Means. It is the property of this convention. We have a committee handling that subject, the Ways and Means Committee. This is a financial proposition. That is the reference of the chair, unless there is a motion made to some other purpose.

DEL. SPARGO: I have so moved. Com. Chairman, that it be referred to the National Executive Committee. I claim that it is not within the province or scope of the work of the Committee on Ways and Means. The functions of the Committee on Ways and Means is to devise ways and

vention to refer this resolution to the Ways and Means chairman decides, to the Ways and Means Committee of this convention. If t

"Well," I said, "that's born deaf and dumb and couldn't talk."

| | | | |
|--|-----|--|-----|
| Calab Lipscomb, Mo..... | 158 | Committee on Ways and Means, nine members: | 190 |
| J. T. Cunniff, Okla..... | 149 | Arthur Le Sueur..... | 181 |
| L. W. Lang, Iowa..... | 143 | Max Boehm..... | 181 |
| E. E. Powell, Ohio..... | 142 | O. S. Watkins..... | 173 |
| Committee on State and Municipal Pro- | | George N. Bacon..... | 177 |
| gram, nine members: | | E. S. Reagan..... | 173 |
| Carl D. Thomson..... | 213 | Margaret D. Brown..... | 166 |
| Anna A. Maley..... | 209 | L. B. Irvin..... | 156 |
| John C. Kennedy..... | 176 | Isaac F. Stewart..... | 151 |
| Margaret L. Prevey..... | 170 | Miles C. Jones..... | 148 |
| Roscoe E. Dooley..... | 147 | Committee on Platform, nine members: | |
| Ernest Berger..... | 142 | Charles Edward Russell..... | 219 |
| Edwin J. Brown..... | 123 | Victor L. Berger..... | 200 |
| George W. Downing..... | 120 | James F. Carey..... | 186 |
| Thomas M. Todd..... | 120 | I. Stitt Wilcox..... | 164 |
| W. W. Farmer..... | 83 | William J. Chen..... | 139 |
| Committee on Party Press, nine mem- | | Dan Hogan..... | 126 |
| bers: | | Charles Probs..... | 118 |
| Mary O'Reilly..... | 207 | A. W. Ricker..... | 118 |
| E. A. Maynard..... | 168 | Committee on Labor Organizations and | |
| W. A. Jacobs..... | 168 | Their Relations to the Socialist Party, nine | |
| J. L. Bachman..... | 163 | members: | |
| Meyer London..... | 152 | Oscar Ameringer..... | 177 |
| Theresa Maitel..... | 152 | James H. Maurer..... | 172 |
| William M. Wesley..... | 150 | Dan White..... | 164 |
| C. E. Owen..... | 149 | Algeron Lee..... | 153 |
| S. E. Beardsley..... | 144 | William E. Rodriguez..... | 141 |
| Fred Kratt..... | 117 | Job Harriman..... | 126 |
| Delegates London and Maitel being | | Robert Lawrence..... | 112 |
| from the same state Delegate Kratt was | | Thomas Clifford..... | 107 |
| made the ninth member of the Committee | | Fred Merrick..... | 98 |
| the chairman stated that two of the | | T. J. Lewis..... | 97 |
| candidates for Committee on State and | | T. A. Hickey..... | 97 |
| Municipal Program, Delegates Maley and | | Of the candidates for this committee, it | |
| Brown being from the state of Washington, | | appearing that White and Lawrence were | |
| under the rules, Delegate Brown having the | | both from Massachusetts and that Maurer | |
| smaller vote, would be dropped from the | | and Merrick were both from Pennsylvania, | |
| committee, and W. W. Farmer would con- | | the Chairman stated that under the rules | |
| stitute the ninth member. | | the smaller number of votes, would be | |
| The vote reported by the tellers on the | | dropped, and Lewis and Hickey were in- | |
| Committee on Resolutions, nine members, | | cluded in the list to complete the commit- | |
| was as follows: | | tee. | |
| Joseph E. Cohen..... | 176 | The Chairman declared that the delegates | |
| John Sparo..... | 176 | reported by the tellers would constitute the | |
| George E. Roever..... | 168 | respective committees of the convention. | |
| Ben Wilson..... | 153 | The convention then adjourned until 10 | |
| E. H. Thomas..... | 151 | o'clock Tuesday morning. | |
| Henry L. Stobodin..... | 148 | | |
| W. P. Collins..... | 138 | | |
| E. R. Melzer..... | 111 | | |
| John G. Wills, Okla..... | 107 | | |

THIRD DAY'S SESSION.

Del. Barnes, Chairman of yesterday, called the convention to order at 10 o'clock A. M., and called for nominations for Chairman of the day. The following delegates were nominated:

O. Branstetter (Okla.). Accepted.
Beardsley (Conn.). Accepted.
Slayton (Pa.). Accepted.
Goebel (N. J.). Accepted.
Strickland (Ohio). Declined.
Richardson (Cal.). Declined.
Thompson (Wis.). Declined.
The vote resulted as follows: Branstetter, 13; Beardsley, 13; Slayton, 56; Goebel, 28. Delegate Branstetter was declared elected Chairman of the day.

Report Vice-Chairman the following nominations were made:

Anna Maley (Wash.). Declined.
Harold Houston (W. Va.). Absent.
May Wood Simons (Kan.). Declined.
There being no acceptances, Del. Killingbeck (N. J.) moved that the candidate receiving the next highest vote for Chairman be Vice-Chairman. Motion seconded.

Del. Hillquit spoke against the motion. The motion was lost by a vote of sixty-four to eighty-one. Nominations for Vice-Chairman were then resumed, and the following delegates were nominated:

Slayton (Pa.). Declined.
Casaday (N. Y.). Declined.
Conrad (Ida.). Declined.
Zitt (Ohio). Declined.
Maley (Wash.). Accepted.
Goebel (N. J.). Declined.
Prevey (Ohio). Declined.
Del. Anna A. Maley of Washington, being the only candidate, was unanimously elected Vice-Chairman for the day.

Del. Kate Sadler (Wash.) in the press only delegates and reporters for the convention be admitted to the floor of the convention. The motion was opposed by several delegates, and was lost.

Del. Bessemer (Ohio) moved that all persons be excluded from the floor of the convention except delegates and their wives, or husbands and Devo Young (Pa.) the motion was laid on the table.

On motion of Del. Young (Pa.) the motion was laid on the table.

Del. Richardson (Cal.) moved to dispense with the reading of the minutes of yesterday.

Del. Strebel (N. Y.) moved that all amendments or corrections of the minutes be taken up and made at the close of the day's session and to be made a special order at that time.

Del. Stobodin (N. Y.) moved to amend that delegates desiring to make corrections or amendments to the minutes hand them in writing to the Secretary at the close of the session.

Del. Strebel accepted the amendment, and the motion as amended was carried.

ADDRESS OF GUITEPEREZ DE LARREA OF MEXICO.

THE CHAIRMAN: The first order of business this morning is to hear the fraternal delegate from Mexico, Comrade De Larrea.

Comrade De Larrea took the platform amid great enthusiasm and spoke as follows:

COMRADE DE LARREA: Comrade Chairman and comrades, I come here to this convention as a fraternal delegate of the Socialist Party in Mexico. I have a mission in coming to this convention. Our comrades in Mexico have endorsed the principles of the revolution. I would better say they have endorsed the revolution since the beginning. Why? Nearly half of our comrades there who are class-conscious Socialists are in the revolution, fighting. They called on me to come here and to ask you to pass some energetic resolutions in regard to the revolution.

Comrades, the revolution in Mexico is a fight of the past hundred years. It is the fight of the farmers, the tillers of the soil, who became the owners of the lands that they are tilling. A hundred years ago by the revolution in Spain was carried out by the tillers of the soil to get the lands from the big land owners in Mexico at that time. The big land owners were the chief of the aristocracy. After ten years of revolution independence was recognized. But the revolutionists were not wise enough to carry out the revolution in a practical way. They were tender and satisfied to have an independent country and a new flag. But soon they realized that they had been fighting for such a small Mexico and to have themselves citizens of Mexico and to have a flag. So they went ahead with the revolution, and about fifteen years later, that is, in the year 1854, the revolutionists were very nearly in a condition to take away the land from the big land owner. If they have not accomplished this, why have they not? Because the church was of only the big land owner in Mexico, but also controlled the conscience of that country, and you know how hard it is for the agitator to take away from a man the idea of his wealth in heaven and his poverty on earth. (Applause.)

But in the year 1832 or 1833 the Mexican people were able to elect a president, whose work was to decree that the Mexican people had no government that could compel them to pay taxes to the church. This revolutionary decree of that revolutionary president aroused to the highest degree the indignation of the church, and then the church went to work and was able to bring as president a man that came to enforce the rights of the church and those of the aristocracy. But this man found that he was unable to enforce those rights destroying the rights of the revolutionists, and found that the people had a higher passion in their hearts, and that passion was patriotism, and the patriotism was aroused in the Mexican people to become an American nation.

In the meantime in the United States the slave holders, who needed to increase the

power of slavery, tried to arouse the patriotism of the American people by an international war. In the slave owners in the United States and the land owners in Mexico that an international war would make the common people of Mexico forget the issue of the ownership of the Mexican lands and make the American people forget the issue of the emancipation of the slaves. (Applause.) The people in both countries were to be induced to go and fight and destroy each other like wild beasts in order to satisfy in Mexico the great ambition of the aristocracy and the church and in order to satisfy in the United States the great ambition of the slave holders.

After the war was over, the Mexican people, defeated, were unable to carry on the revolutionary issue of the ownership of the land by the toilers of the soil. Why? The American people were toiles. They were toiles because the fight with Mexico was only for the purpose of enforcing slavery. That was the kind of victory that was gained by the American people. After the big victory was decided, the American people of the South fought with the American people of the North over the issue of freeing the negro slaves. But, after the negro slaves had been freed there remained necessary another fight in this country in order to free you slaves. (Applause.)

So, after the war was over, another revolution started in Mexico. The platform of that revolution, which was in 1851-2, was that the Mexican people needed another constitution, because the old constitution proclaimed in the first years of independence was a constitution in which were recognized the rights and privileges of the church and of the aristocracy, and this new revolution of the toiles was for the purpose of giving up the old constitution and framing a new constitution that would embody the necessities and the aspirations of the common people in Mexico. That new constitution was proclaimed in the month of February, 1857, and that constitution gave to all the freedom that we needed, respect, free press and free compulsory education. But the great point in this constitution was that it took away the land from the church proclaiming that the church, being a divine institution, had not the right to own anything else. So about two and a half to three millions of toilers of the soil thus became owners of independent lands.

Immediately on the adoption of this constitution, the wealthy class of Mexico, the church and the aristocracy, found that a tremendous blow had been struck against them. The church and aristocracy claimed the army in Mexico in those years. The army in Mexico, as everywhere in the world, has been the most dangerous foe of the emancipation of the people. The church and aristocracy claimed the army, and the army started a series of military riots in order to be prepared to destroy the lives of three million toilers of the soil who were now free and independent men. There was a civil war of three years between the church and army and the common people, and after three years of civil war the common people were able to entirely defeat the church and the aristocracy. When the church and aristocracy surrendered, then they sent delegates to Europe to ask help in order that the European powers might send their armies to Mexico for the purpose of restoring the lands to the church and to the aristocracy. England, France and in the year 1861, England, France and Spain agreed to send their armies to Mex-

ico, and those armies were sent. But as mistake as England and Spain realized their mistake and the trouble they were likely to have on their hands, they withdrew their armies. But France, ruled by Napoleon III—the Teddy Roosevelt of those years in France (applause)—France invaded Mexico and placed Emperor Maximilian in power. This invasion was nothing else but a tool used by the Mexican church and Mexican aristocracy, and a tool also used by the Pope of Rome and the Emperor of France in order that they might come and, in the name of some farcical laws, take away the lands from the common people and restore them to the church and aristocracy. (Applause.)

This international war lasted about nine years, and you who read Mexican history from an economic standpoint can see how by this time the Mexican people had twice been able to accomplish the fact of giving the lands to the common people. A foreign invader had come into Mexico, but had been compelled to surrender after, having come to give back the lands to the church and aristocracy. That has been the other purpose of Mexican foreign wars. After the French war was over the Mexican people were entirely broken down by those nine years of war. A republic was established and the people began to take up the question of the lands.

But after a few years the church took back the stranger and allied with the aristocracy and allied with the army and with the soldiery, who, at the time of the French war, started a series of military riots against the rule of the common people, for the purpose of gaining the ownership of the lands of the common people. After a while they succeeded and gained power, but they were foxy enough to understand that by this time the church was not in condition to become the owner of the land, and then they took this land from the common people and gave it back to the favorites. That was the only cause of the despotism maintained by Diaz during the thirty years in which he carried on his military despotic autocracy.

Comrades, a year and a half ago another revolution started, with the same old question, the lands for the common people. That was the only purpose of the revolution, and will be the only purpose of any revolution in Mexico. Mr. Madero, today's president in Mexico, came to the revolutionary movement at the last moment of the revolution. This has been the case with other revolutionists in Mexico. We, the old revolutionists, the pioneers of the revolution, know that Madero will be unwilling and unable to accomplish a solution of the question of the ownership of the lands by the common people. But the Mexican masses, who have not as much experience as we may have, were unwilling to have Madero as president to stop the revolutionary movement without taking away the lands by force from the common people, and to see if Madero could settle the question of the lands. But, fortunately, the common people in Mexico were quick to realize that this question of the lands cannot be settled by one individual, that it had to be settled by themselves, and nobody but themselves. (Applause.) And they went ahead with the revolution, and that is the purpose of the present revolution in Mexico.

Madero belonged to a very wealthy family of multimillionaires. They owned immense tracts of land in Mexico, and does anybody suppose that Mr. Madero and his

father and grandfather and children and grandchildren and his nephews and cousins and relatives are going to give up their lands to the common people? They are not. So the revolution is now in a critical moment. Right now our comrades are fighting in Mexico, and in a few days more they will succeed in this revolution and will give the lands to the common people. (Applause.) Yes, the revolutionists have agreed among themselves as to give the lands to the common people, soon as they take De la Torre. Madero has got to a place right now where he is soon to as they take this place they will begin to confiscate the lands. That means they will recognize the right of the toiler of the soil to be the owner of the land that he is tilling. (Applause.)

In Mexico the big land owners used to give to every peon a small patch of land. The peon had to use this patch of land and give half of the crop to his master. And besides that, there is another big patch of land reserved by the owners of the land on which the peon, besides giving half of the crop from his patch of land, and worked for 25 cents a day for his of the revolution, one since the beginning of the revolution, year and a half ago, there have been a great many peons that are peons no more. They consider themselves as the owners of the patch of land, and they have been raising the crops on those patches and taking the crops for themselves because the masters have no more policemen or soldiers to compel them to give the half crop to the masters. (Applause) The revolution is going to succeed. In the next two or three months there will be a beginning, at least, in the division of the lands, and before the revolution is accomplished, the division of the lands will be accomplished. After that, under this agreement of the leaders of the revolution, will come a government, elected, of course, by these small land owners, and this government will legalize this part of the revolution that has been accomplished. It is now a question that the government is going to divide the lands. The lands are going to be taken by the men themselves, going to be taken by the men themselves, and that has been done. That is the scheme; what has been done. That is the scheme; that is the plan of the revolution.

About two weeks ago a man came to Chihuahua and called himself provisional president of Chihuahua, of Mexico. The revolutionists told him, "We do not need any more provisional presidents. We are not fighting for provisional presidents; we are fighting for the lands, and so you was out of here." (Applause.) The man was already indicted by the American government, and so he chose to be a political prisoner. You see how the revolution can make political prisoners. It is a much better way than political prisoners are made in the United States.

Well, in this revolution, comrades, there will be no one man, there will be no individual. Right now you know about that man Orozco, who appears as leader of the revolutionists; and certainly Orozco is nothing else but one of the mediums in the future and if Orozco tries some time in the future to impose his will against the purpose of the revolution Orozco will not last a day before he will be hanged by the revolution. (Applause.)

So the issue is very clear now. The division of the lands will be accomplished. The revolution will be successful, but there is the threat of the old times, the American

government doing everything possible to interfere in Mexico, with the only purpose to compel the Mexican workers to serve their masters and to protect the property of American citizens. They say that the intervention of the American government will be only for the purpose of protecting American life and American property in Mexico, but it will be with the purpose of carrying on the issue so that it is well understood by the master class, and that issue is that the class-conscious master class in the United States feel the necessity of helping their brothers, the master class of Mexico. (Applause.)

Comrades, I recognize that American life in Mexico is very well protected. The only thing endangering American life in Mexico is the American government, by its foolishness and its stupidity, telling the United States: Mexico to go back to the United States; while in fact there are so many Americans in Mexico who have as much business there and who are enjoying how to the Mexicans, and who are enjoying how the American government with the help of the Mexican people, and they see that they will be the first victims of the stupidity of the American government. The Americans do not want to be saved by the American government, and they will remain in Mexico. About three weeks ago my wife and myself were on the battleship, running a small boarding house. My wife asked her, "Don't you feel that your life is in danger? Don't you feel that you would like to go to the United States?" And the woman said, "What business have I to go to the United States? I have no business there. Even if it sometimes happens that I will go to the United States, I will have to carry my Mexican coat, because in the United States there is no good coat for me, and I stay here, home." In the meantime, about ten days ago, from her house, the revolutionists were riding on horseback and making themselves ready for the next battle. That women will be as safe in Mexico as she can women in the United States. (Applause.)

So, comrades, I feel that this question of intervention, from the standpoint of the Socialist Party, may be one of the most serious questions covered by your resolutions. You can see how, three times in the last thirty years, France and Germany have been very near to having an international war, and how the French Socialists and German Socialists have taken a very energetic attitude against their governments in order to prevent international war, and for the comrades in Germany have gone so far as to threaten Emperor William with under war if German soldiers crossed the borderline to France. (Applause.) They know, stand very well the issue, and we know too, that when the American soldier crosses the boundary line into Mexico into pockets to support him comes from your class, and when American soldiers are sent to Mexico the government is sending men of your class to go to Mexico to death or suffering to death or suffering. I feel that this is just the time for the Socialist Party of the United States to take the most energetic stand against the question of intervention. This is the time for the Socialist Party of the United States to stand together and pass the most energetic resolutions against this monkey business of the American government. (Applause.)

I have been in the Congress in Mexico. They told me to bring this message to some of the bourgeois politicians. They recognized that the American people—which means Wall Street and the middle class—will do a very bad business with intervention in Mexico. Most of those men say to me, "We have no business to interfere in Mexico. Let the Mexicans fight their own battles and do what they please with their hands." So you see that, at least, the middle class take that position on this question. If you take an energetic stand against this intervention there will be no intervention in Mexico. And, there being no intervention in Mexico, we are going to have at least four millions of men free and intelligent men, because they will be the owners of the means of production in the agricultural way. Besides that, we have about a million industrial workers who are starting to fight now a splendid, glorious organization, in order to fight the battles of the class-conscious proletariat all over the world to-day (Applause). And these, our splendid comrades, can be carried on if you come against the intervention of the United States so that we may have in the future in Mexico a free nation and a glorious battlefield for the battles to come of the working class. (Applause)

DEL STALLARD (Kan.): I move that the request of Comrade Delata be referred to the Committee on International Relations, with instructions to draft a strong resolution covering his request, and insisting that the workers of the United States have no quarrel with the workers of Mexico, and we demand that the United States does not intervene in the Mexican revolution.

THE CHAIRMAN: It has been moved and seconded that the request of Comrade Delata be referred to the Foreign Relations Committee, with instructions to that committee to draft a strong resolution against American intervention in Mexico. The motion of Del Stallard was carried unanimously.

COMRADE HAYWOOD: I rise to a matter of personal privilege. At yesterday's session there was received by this convention a telegram from Denver, Colo. It purported to contain charges—

DEL SPARGO: A point of order.

THE CHAIRMAN: State your point of order.

DEL SPARGO: That communication was tabled yesterday. It remains tabled. THE CHAIRMAN: Your point is not well taken. Comrade Haywood, state your question of personal privilege.

COMRADE HAYWOOD: I wanted to point out that the action of the convention was to table that telegram. By consent of Chairman Barnes, who acted yesterday, the contents of that telegram were given to the press and it appears in the Indianapolis Star this morning.

Now, I would ask that that telegram be read to the convention. That it be read into the records of the convention; and from now on all communications, in my opinion, should be read into the minutes before they are read into the press.

(Cheers) In connection with the charges in that telegram, I want to say that they are not the charges of Denver, but they are charges that were brought against me in Local Bridgeport, and sent from Bridgeport to Denver, where they were taken up by an

individual enemy of mine. Now, the committee that has been investigating these charges has recommended to Local Denver that they be dropped.

This telegram, then, has been sent at the instigation of this individual, who is a member of Branch 10.

Now, the charges, comrades, are these: That I organized, or helped to organize, a dual union of machinists. The truth of the matter is that I spoke under the auspices of the Brotherhood of Machinists. This is a rival organization to the International Association of Machinists. Robert A. Lecky of New York City is the secretary of the Brotherhood of Machinists. I felt perfectly justified in speaking against an organization that is offered, as the Incited by an association of machinists is offered by the Civil Redoubt.

A NUMBER OF DELEGATES: Point of order.

THE CHAIRMAN: State the point of order.

DEL RODRIGUEZ: I contend that Comrade Haywood is not talking on a matter of personal privilege, but as usual is simply denouncing everything that he does not agree with. I want it understood that I have no objection to Comrade Haywood speaking to a question of personal privilege in a proper way.

THE CHAIRMAN: I have heard your point of order. While a comrade should not take advantage of a question of personal privilege as an opportunity to express his individual views, or to attack anyone with whom he disagrees, the chair rules that Comrade Haywood has not wandered very far from his rights. Comrade Haywood will please bear in mind that he should not take advantage of this privilege.

COM HAYWOOD: I appreciate that; I am going to take but a very few minutes more.

I have disposed of the question of having organized a dual union.

It is alleged in the charges, and I am likewise charged with organizing a dual Socialist local. I want to say in connection with this that I was invited by a committee known as the Lawrence Strikers' Aid Committee to go to Bridgeport and deliver a speech in behalf of the Lawrence strikers. Local Bridgeport, a few days prior to that meeting, sent me a registered letter in which they threatened that they would have charges preferred against me and threatened my expulsion if I spoke in Bridgeport under the auspices of what they were pleased to term a rebel organization.

I wrote to them and urged upon them the necessity of getting together for this occasion for the purpose of supporting the Lawrence strikers, told them that it would be impossible for me to decline, as the welfare of the Lawrence strikers was at stake. I then telegraphed them that I was going to Local Bridgeport and held a meeting in the same night which was on Women's Day. That meeting was held to deprive us and the Lawrence strikers of the benefit of the crowd that we would have had on that occasion. Now we raised at that time a considerable amount of money for the Lawrence strikers.

Now, Comrade Chairman, Bridgeport Local that pretends the charges against me contributed to the Lawrence strike. They raised twelve dollars and they turned it over to John Golden, who was scabbing on us every minute.

DEL McLEVEY (Conn.): Comrades, Comrade Haywood has stated that—

THE CHAIRMAN: In stating that on a matter of personal privilege, you must bear in mind that you cannot engage in a discussion. You can only go into the matter as it refers to you individually and personally. We cannot open this subject for a debate on the whole question. Personal privilege applies to the individual and not to the organization. It is a matter of personal privilege. If you have anything as an individual as to reflections made by Comrade Haywood on you as an individual, it is in order. If you are going to talk in defense of Local Bridgeport you have not the floor.

A DELEGATE: What right has a comrade to attack Bridgeport Local without the charges being read? I move that the telegram charging Haywood with these different charges be taken from the table and now read.

THE CHAIRMAN: It is moved and seconded that the telegram from Local Denver be taken from the table and read.

DEL COLLINS (Colo.): I want to say that we voted solidly yesterday to have this read; we asked to have it read; and I am in favor of it now. I hope the motion will carry.

The motion to have telegram referred to read was carried, and the telegram was read as follows:

"Denver, Colo., May 13, 1912.

"Secretary Socialist Convention,

"Tomlinson Hall, Indianapolis, Ind.
"At a regular meeting of the Tenth Ward Branch of the Socialist Party of Denver the following resolution was adopted: We protest against W. D. Haywood being recognized as having any voice or vote in the convention now assembled in Indianapolis, as there are now charges against him here in Local Denver, which have never been disposed of. Said charges are now charges of the trial committee, who have the hands of the said charges, who have never been preferred against him are reasons to the party and conduct him as being a Socialist. Also charges against him by Local Socialist Party, Com., for organizing dual Socialist clubs consisting of expelled members of Bridgeport Central Local. On these grounds we claim he has no right to be recognized in the convention."

"SARAH A. LEONARD,

"Secretary of Tenth Ward Branch,"

"Denver, Colo."

DEL CLIFFORD (Ohio): I wish to ask the Colorado delegation whether the Colorado they consider the branch that the telegram the unit? My reason is that the telegram comes from Branch 10 of Local Denver.

THE CHAIRMAN: The question may be answered by the press.

DEL GIBBS (Colo.): I am a member of the same general branch to which Comrade Haywood belongs. I can answer the question that has just been asked. In Denver we have the ward form of organization, this Tenth Ward Branch is simply a branch of the general city organization. We have about 18 altogether. This comprises only a few members; it is not a strong branch in Denver. I am surprised that that branch—

THE CHAIRMAN: The question has been answered; that is all that is necessary.

DEL GIBBS: I want to say that it does not come by authority of the central organization. THE CHAIRMAN: That answers the question. Motions are in order.

DEL SPARGO: I move that now that the telegram has been read it be laid on the table.

THE CHAIRMAN: It has been moved and seconded that this telegram do lie on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was carried.

DEL WILLIAMS (Pa.): A question of personal privilege. Is it not a proper question of personal privilege if a member of this body or a comrade having a voice on this floor asserts and makes misstatements about his organization?

DEL WILLIAMS: Not necessarily.

DEL WILLIAMS: I would like to correct a misstatement about the International Association of Machinists being offered by the Militia of Christ.

THE CHAIRMAN: That is not a question of personal privilege.

DEL KATP SADLER (Wash.): I have a motion.

THE CHAIRMAN: Nothing but the regular order of business is in order.

DEL KATP SADLER: This is in order. I move that all communications shall be read from the platform and nothing shall be given to the press that does not appear in our minutes.

The motion was seconded.

THE CHAIRMAN: It is moved and seconded that all communications shall be read from the platform, and that no communications or the contents thereof shall be given to the press until it has been so read to the convention.

DEL THOMPSON (Wis.): I do not think we should place ourselves in a position where it is necessary for us to read from the platform every communication, because there may come some foolish propositions that we do not want to have read at all. We ought not to humiliate ourselves by compelling everything to be read that anybody may choose to send us. But we ought to insist on one thing, that no communication received here shall be given out to the press until given out by order of the convention. I want to divide the question to move to amend by dividing the second to delete the first part and carry the point of order.

DEL SPARGO: I make the point of order.

THE CHAIRMAN: The point of order is well taken. We will now take up the next order of business.

DEL BEARDSLEY (Conn.): The entire delegation of Connecticut protests against the ruling in this matter of personal privilege. If a comrade is allowed to take the floor and attack Socialist Party of Connecticut and a particular local of Connecticut, then that local ought to have the right to present their side of the matter.

COMMUNICATIONS.

Communications were then read by the Secretary from:

Jewish Socialist Branch, Memphis, Tenn.

Young Peoples Socialist Federation, New York.

W. E. Trautman and others, in regard to the Lawrence strike.

These communications were referred to the Committee on Resolutions.

It was moved and seconded that all communications from locals or others than delegates to this convention be read by syndicates only and thus referred to the appropriate committees.

NATIONAL, SOCIALIST CONVENTION

Gertrude B. Hunt, Pennsylvania, lecturer.
Accepted.
Meia L. Berger, Milwaukee, housewife.
Absent; dropped.
Wm. L. Gaver, Missouri, architect and
draftsman. Accepted.
Margaret Prevey, Ohio, teacher. Declined.
Ruth Stokes Brown, California, teacher.
Declined.
James F. Carey, Massachusetts, shoe-
maker. Declined.
Charles A. Byrd, Texas University. De-
clined.
Vita D. Scudder, Wellesley College. Ab-
sent; dropped.
Professor Svyjo, Minnesota, school prin-
cipal. Accepted.
Gustave A. Strebel, New York, clothing
cutter. Accepted.
Emil Siedel, Wisconsin, carpenter, design-
er, patternmaker. Accepted.
May Wood Simons, Kansas, teacher. Ac-
cepted.
George Clifton Edwards, Texas, teacher.
Declined.
Mary L. Gelfs, Colorado, newspaper re-
porter and dressmaker. Declined.
Morris Kaplan, Minnesota. Declined.

AFTERNOON SESSION.

The Chairman called the convention to order at 2:30 P. M.

THE CHAIRMAN: I want to call attention to an error in the list of committees elected yesterday as printed. There are eighteen names given under the head of Committee on Constitution. Only the first nine are the ones elected to that committee. The other nine are the Committee on Labor Organizations.

DEL. BERGER (N. Y.): The Committee on Foreign Speaking Organizations is omitted.

THE CHAIRMAN: If my recollection serves me right, the Committee on Foreign Relations and several other committees were elected on the floor and do not appear on the printed list. The reports of committees are now in order. The list of committees will be read and any that are ready to be read may do so.

The list of committees was read by the Secretary, and Delegate Thompson of Wisconsin announced that the Committee on Commission Form of Government was ready to report.

It was moved and seconded that the convention take up the report of the Committee on the Commission Form of Government.* Adopted.

DEL. THOMPSON (WIS.). The report of this committee is too long to be read. You have the printed reports before you, or if not there are enough of them printed and can be secured by the delegates.

THE CHAIRMAN. There was a motion adopted yesterday that all reports should be read.

DEL. ALEXANDER (Tex.): I move to dispense with that rule or to suspend the rule, rather, with respect to this particular report. It is very lengthy.

The motion to suspend the rules and allow the motion to suspend the reading of the report was carried.

DET. THOMPSON: There are a few things, however, that I should like to call your attention to in connection with this report.

In the first place, your committee, for the past two years, has been gathering from every possible source information on this subject, from magazine articles, pamphlets, correspondence, books, leaflets, letters from the various locals, and other material. We

| | |
|--------------------------------------|-----------|
| Henry L. Slobohin, New York, lawyer. | Accepted. |
| Winne E. Branstetter, Oklahoma. | Declined. |
| Dr. Rosette, Maryland, physician. | Accepted. |
| N. A. Richardson, California. | Absent. |
| John G. Ohsig, Massachusetts. | labor |
| I. Clifford, Ohio, printer. | Deceased. |

John Slayton, Pennsylvania, carpenter.
Accepted.
The convention then adjourned until 2:30
P. M.

SESSION.

had assistance in Wisconsin at the Municipal Reference Library at Milwaukee which is always glad to help in assembling material along these lines. We also had the help of Librarian Wilsenko, who is always very willing to help in gathering materials and assembling it. In addition to this material which we gathered in these different ways, Comrade Jacobson, the chairman of the committee, assembled names of the secretaries of the locals in the various cities that had the commissary form of organization. I also received information about forty different questions bearing upon this subject; 16 letters of this kind were sent out and 76 replies were received up to the present time, and they are still coming. So that we think that we have received a pretty good proportion of replies to these letters.

We get that you have on your

Now the report that you have on the tables is the result of that work. It is reported to you unanimously by the committee, with the exception of one member who did not come to this convention and who therefore was unable to meet with us, and we were unable to get a meeting until just before the convention assembled, when we got our committee together.

Now, I would call your attention very briefly to the features of this report. I think that will be all that will be necessary for this time. The first part of the report, beginning on page 2, is simply a discussion of the extent and the rate of growth of the commission form of government, which, as we point out, began very slowly, increased quickly, and then has rather diminished its rate of growth.

On page 3 there is a discussion of the size of the cities adopting it. We show that almost without exception it has been in the smaller cities that have adopted it. Since this report was sent to the printer, Minn. has been received that St. Paul and Wm. has adopted this form of government. That then is the largest city, having a population of 214,000.

Then follows a discussion of the essential features and the non-essential features

*The report is printed in full as Appendix C.—Editor.

AFTERNOON SESSION, MAY 14, 1912

(ures), and the characteristic of this report, distinguishing it from all other studies of the commission form of government, is this: that we hold that such details as the initiative, referendum, recall, home rule, civil service, provisions of the commission not essential features of the commission form of government, because cities that do not have the commission form have these features, all or some of them; some cities have them, some nations have them; and some have not, showing that they are not essential to the commission form.

We did not wish to go too much into controversial matters in this report, but on page five we have taken up the consideration of the results of this commission form.

Our reports differ. There is a mass

Now reports differ. There is a mass of information on both sides outside of Socialist sources. Some of them are very much in favor and report that it has been very successful. Others report that it hasn't been successful. You can read it and decide for yourselves what your judgment is; what your opinion ought to be from this information.

On page 6 we mention some of the favorable and some of the unfavorable reports showing that there is a difference of opinion even among the non-Socialists.

On page 9 we report the result of our opinion poll letters. There you will find some very peculiar things. You will find in the first place that some of the Socialist localities are very much in favor of the communist form of government. Some of the localities are very much opposed to it. Considerably more of the locals are opposed to it than favor it. Quite a number of fact do not stand where they stand; and in question, anywhere on the one question. I suppose neither for or against it. Several of the people from locals in different parts of the country have written us these two years asking us to tell them where they actually stood on the subject. And of course we had to assume the judicial attitude, and tell them that we would have to wait until you told us where they stood. That is the purpose of this report. The result of the reports from the localities you will find on page 3.

On page 11 we take up the arguments for and against the localities; and then you permit me to point out three at least of the principal objections to the commission form of government. You will find, beginning at the bottom of page 10, "Objectionable Features," the first of which is "Extreme Concentration," the second on page 12, the non-partizan policy; the third one on page 14, the elimination of minority representation. And then we take up some other general objections.

On page 15 we discuss some of the claim put forth by the opponents of the commission form of Government and we try to show what we believe to be true, that many of the claims put forth by the friends of the commission form are without foundation. That they are not well established I would like to ask those of you who are following the time to strike out for at the present time one part of a sentence at the bottom of page 15. It got in by mistake and we would like to have it out. Take and we would like that reads, "This shows the sentence has sufficient ground for have given them sufficient ground for refusing to submit the matter." That sentence should be stricken out. The committee wishes to have it stricken out; it will be stricken out in the final print report.

There is one feature in regard to this commission form of government which it seems to us should not have been overlooked by those all writers on this subject, and that is the experience of other countries in the effort to solve the problems of municipal government. The commission form of government we point out is an entirely new proposition. There is no precedent for it anywhere in the world. We point out that while in the best governed cities of the world are beyond question the second cities of Germany, and the next best cities are the from the standpoint of efficiency are the cities of England, and a third the next best governed the cities of France, yet the advocates of the commission form and the best writers have practically ignored nearly all writers have practically ignored the experience of other nations in the solution of these problems of municipal government. 19 We point out certain desiderata.

On page 19 we point out certain features of municipal government in their relation to the commission form. There are certain features which the commission form in connection with the council always find in government which are indispensable. And we point out that it is important not to take an indiscriminate position to commission form of government, because that might seem to place us in opposition to certain features which we would all desire. The particular thing that party should take in, and a particular thing that state should be determined by the particular form and the specific features sought to be adopted. For instance, a commission of the members may be an excellent thing for one municipality, but probably is the most efficient in small cities. A governing body we do not believe in large cities. Home rule body is desirable in large cities. Every student of course we all believe in Every student of municipal problems knows that in the mind of all other countries one of the fundamental purposes of capitalistic government is to bind cities down so that they cannot adopt radical changes which would favor the working class. Every extension of the right of home rule to the municipalities is a great help in securing municipal ownership, ship, direct employment, trades union conditions, and many other important matters. A faculty when the committee came to

ers, finally, when the committee came to the question of recommendations, the committee did not feel that it would be right to attempt to make any specific recommendations as to what any certain local or state organization should do apart from the general principles that we have discussed in the report for the obvious reason that there are hardly any two cities or two states that have the same form of commission government. Therefore, the only thing we could say to you is that you would have to study the particular form of commission government that is up for discussion in your city or state and with reference to the actual situation there, you will refer to the principles that you put at the end of the report and then locally decide what your attitude shall be. That is because of the general variation in the laws and in the character of the cities.

However, there was one thing upon which the committee agreed last sentence: "That a committee be appointed by the convention to study government, and to submit a report of their work as a basis for a formal proposal to be proposed as an alternative plan to improve upon the commission plan. Now the thought of your committee is that the capitalistic reform forces in this country

try seem to think that they are called upon to make a contribution to the solution of this most difficult of all American problems, that of municipal government; and their contribution is this commission form of government. That is their last, best and wisest word. Your committee feel that that is not the very wisest word; they are sure it is not the last or best word on the question of the best form of municipal government. But, comrades, your committee also feel that if we were able to say to answer the next question that is sure to come, namely, "Well, what have you that answered offhand. It can only be answered after an exhaustive, thorough going study of the whole problem of municipal government in all its forms, and with constant reference to the working class of this country for a new civilization, for better forms of government and for the democratic organization of all industry."

So our recommendation on that point is that this be attempted; that a committee be appointed to deal with this matter. I believe I speak for the whole matter. When I say that we feel that it is up to the Socialist Party to make on this question of the best form of municipal government the same kind of constructive contribution that we have made on many other serious social problems of the day. And we want to do that.

I move the adoption of the report.

The motion for the adoption of the report was duly seconded.

DELL MORGAN (Minn.): On page 12 you say: "The elimination of parties is a seriously objectionable feature." Am I to understand you to say by this report that the commission form of government by necessity is non-partisan. If so, you are mistaken. The commission form of government, of its principle, can be added to any kind of government, the federal form, or the county form, or any other. If you mean that it is not true; it is not the fact. Do I understand the committee to mean that if a community adopts the commission form of government the committee necessarily must be a non-partisan body? DELL THOMPSON: We do not mean to say that. If you had read the report entirely you would see that in another place we analyze the various state and city laws and show just what proportion of them are non-partisan election and what proportion does not. There are a little more than half of the state and city laws that require a non-partisan election. All the non-partisan idea is made a part of the commission form there is failure. We do not believe in non-partisan elections.

DELL MORGAN: As I come from the largest city that has adopted this commission form of government, and it will not be in effect for two years, and it is very evident that it is an experiment all over the country I very thoroughly stand in favor of the recommendation that a committee be appointed to still consider this problem and to present something if government of our great cities. It does work well in small cities; it has been in effect in some small cities for over a hundred years; but under the name of the commission form. Some small cities elect three commissioners, a mayor, others two and a mayor. They have the whole government of a little village or town in their hands; that is virtually the commission form of

government. That seems to work well. It has been adopted in many small towns. It has evidently recommended itself and its use is rapidly increasing. The question, however, is now coming up to the large cities, and Saint Paul is the largest city that has yet adopted it, and there it can think it would be well to consider this question more, because the important point made by Comrade Thompson is this: If of government, our local objected to the by an overwhelming majority, with the privilege of amending it—the question is put up to us whenever we oppose this form of government what have you to offer that is better for a great city like this? This is a great question like this? needs earnest and intelligent consideration. I hope this convention will not go off half cocked, and show one of the problems. I think we believe it patiently for two years; let this investigation go on with our ablest men engaged. It and see if we cannot come finally to some scientific solution of this one of our greatest problems, because American cities are the most disastrously misgoverned cities in the world. We know that German and English cities come nearer to efficient government. Glasgow is almost governed by the commission form; they center the power in three or four or five. It is one of the best governed cities in the world.

I hope this will carry and for the next two years an efficient committee will thoroughly investigate the whole matter.

DELL: The SEILER (N. D.): In connection with this discussion I wish just to offer a few remarks before you act upon it. I wish to give you a few facts. We have gone through the commission form of government in many cities. We have had experience with it in office and out of office and we happen to know something more about its actual operation than some of you comrades who have not had the experience. I refer to Minot, N. D. I want to call your attention to some of the statements made in this report not to criticize but to elucidate. I want to say now that there are objections in this report to the commission form of government that are not founded, if they are taken literally. Remember that committee. I have no doubt that they have done the best that could be done with the information at hand; and they are entitled to the results obtained. But there are some objections in this report to the commission form of government that are not well taken or that the commission form does away with minority representation. Nothing could be further from the truth. Take the council form of government where you elect by wards, and there you have 51 per cent in each ward represented and the other 49 per cent unrepresented. If there are 49 tickets 35 per cent may elect and the other 66 be unrepresented. But when the commission form is adopted there is a provision in the law in our state that does give you real minority representation. It is provided for by the cumulative system of voting which is not commuted upon here. The committee seems to have had no information on the cumulative system of voting in many commission cities. That is to say if three or four commissioners are to be elected, the voter has the right to cast one vote for each commissioner who

is to be elected; but the voter may if he choose cast all his votes for one candidate, and that gives you real practical, democratic minority representation. Now you all ought to know that.

Again, with reference to the non-partisan feature. It has been our experience in our city—and we have a few Socialists in there—we are numerous enough even at this stage of the game to have brought about the issuance of a license for a regular marriage ceremony for the two old parties—it has been our experience in our town that the Socialist Party organization is the only party organization that can maintain its efficiency and its integrity and hold its party together without the party name on the ballot. We have demonstrated that at least in North Dakota the Socialists can do that and can survive and flourish in the face of a non-partisan ballot. It is not merely an educational qualification, they must know who they are voting for; they must know some social politician tell them to vote the ticket straight.

Again, as to the fact that in foreign countries there are so far as the committee knows no party is concerned I want to say that the commission form of government is not a cut and dried affair; and of all the parties in American today the Socialist Party ought to be the very last party to side step a thing merely because it is new.

This report makes practically no recommendations at all, and I think it ought to. Remember, comrades, this is not offered by way of criticism; but by way of suggestion. The last sentence of the report reads as follows: "One thing, however, your committee would recommend, viz., that a committee be appointed by the convention to study further the best forms of municipal government and to submit the results of their work as a basis for a form that may be proposed as an alternative and improvement upon the commission plan."

Now, that is right. We have today in this country hundreds of cities that are in the condition that Saint Paul was a couple of weeks ago, debating the question of adopting this form of government. The Socialist Party owes it to the National Party all over the country after the National Executive Committee has pronounced literature binding and unanimously condemning the commission form of government, without knowing what it was, to state something specific on this question. I therefore move that the matter be amended as follows: That the matter of endorsing the commission form of government, the one which must be settled by the state organizations owing to the great variations in the laws concerning that form of government.

The motion was seconded.

THE CHAIRMAN: It has been moved and seconded that the report be amended to the effect that each state shall decide to the attitude of that state on the commission form of government, owing to the varying state of the laws and the different kinds of commission government.

DELL SLOBODIN (N. Y.): I move an amendment to the amendment that this report be referred to a committee of nine to be elected by the National Committee, that committee to report its findings and recommendation to the National Committee for action.

The amendment of Delegate Slobodin was duly seconded.

DELL SLOBODIN: I want to say that this

convention cannot adopt a book containing matters of policy which may be controverted; we cannot adopt an essay. We do not adopt these or essays. We adopt recommendations of policy, or for action. We must adopt resolutions here for the guidance of comrades who have written to the committee to know where they stand. That committee now appeals to us for information where they stand. What do we say here? We adopt a question without an answer. We are not in a position to give the answer any questions. Therefore we ought to refer them to a committee for action; but not to wait for another convention. Let that committee be elected by the National Committee. That committee is as elect a committee; and that committee should act at once and report to the National Committee its recommendations for that committee to adopt or reject as they see fit.

In New York state we have gone on record as opposing the commission form of government. But I am not going to discuss that matter now. That is not the immediate issue. It is as important a question however, as will ever come before this convention, the question of the government of the cities of this country, because that is where Socialism bids up in control of the government. Now we may be wrong; the Socialist Party by giving certain guiding resolutions to the locals of the party may be wrong, but it is better to be wrong and find it out than to take no action whatever. I want this party to take some stand on this question. Is it in favor of the commission form of government or is it opposed to it. It would not do to say we leave it to the state. It does not do for New York to oppose the commission form of government and New Jersey to favor it. When we come to exchange speakers how can our speakers be consistent. The Socialist Party should take some stand upon this question.

DELL WILSON (Cal.): I think that one of the most unfortunate things that has happened in our ranks since the last congress was the action that was taken on the question of the commission form of government. I speak to you as one having some experience with the commission form of government. The city of Berkeley is so administered. The new charter has been in effect now for four years; and we are now working under that charter. And with the experience that we have had in the city of Berkeley and the other cities of California where the commission form of government is established I wish to say that from my experience and observation that I am profoundly convinced that the commission form of government is superior for our purposes as Socialists to any other previous form of city organization.

A DELLEGATE: Provided Socialists are in power. DELL WILSON: I will take up that point in a minute. I am now giving you my experience in the first place we found this: Berkeley every city in the state of California where we were conducting a campaign with the non-partisan ballot, the short ballot and the only organization that could hold its strength through the campaign; that the only political organization that could hold its strength through the Socialist organization. That is the fact. In Alameda, in Vallejo, in Modesto, in Santa Cruz, in Los

Angels, in all these cities in the state of California in every one without exception, we had all sorts of parties struggling for a place on the ballot. In almost every case we came out at least second on the ballot, with the others disgraced and only one ahead of us. Now you can see the reason of that. The others were divided on candidates, on principles, we were united on our principles, and we forged to the front in every city, and a little better co-operation between our party and the trades union would have put us in the saddle in half a dozen cities in the state of California. After the primary election coming second place in many divided, the trades union primary election, while we were the best in fighting shape. We had fought as a unit and continued as a unit. At the next place when we came to the question of administration. If we elected our candidates to office under the commission form of government that form of government is much more compact and a more adequate instrument for the administration of city affairs than the old ward system or any other system of city organization that we have yet had in this country. The mayor and councilmen meet every day to discuss and conduct the affairs of the municipality; they take up the matters at their hand and proceed to attend to them. That is impossible under the old methods.

Now these various forms of commission government vary. They vary in the form of organization. But the one principle is there; and what we need to do according to my experience is this: not oppose the commission form of government but improve the city charters in the various cities. We want to perfect the form of administration. We must perfect the operation. We must see that they are inserted in every city charter. We want to give power to the city council so that they can deal with the public service corporations, and with municipal administration; that is to say, increase and extend the powers of the council for reaching out over and taking hold of everything that we Socialists stand for. That is what we need to do.

That might have added one other item that I may bring in now. In every city in the state of California where we had the commission form of government, when our candidates were nominated that it lined up our Socialist forces as nothing had ever done before, in those cities. That is the fact. I believe that is entirely undisputed in the state of California. Therefore what I think should be done, although I make no motion in regard to it, is this: that instead of Socialists flooding the country with anti-commission form of government literature, a mere negation, without any constructive proposition whatever; that it is our business to get to the root of this question, perfect a proposition for the commission form of government, go to the take hold of it and perfect it, and make it an instrument for successful city government, an instrument for Socialist success instead of blindly and unintelligently attacking it.

DEL. BYRD (Tex.): I wish to say to the comrades that I understand in the city of Galveston after that the wickedness of that city, for the democrats of Texas got no nearer that he would send the balance of

them to hell; and the state legislature also said, "The Lord is and thus" and they gave them the commission form of government. And for a while they gave the people a scared honest government. But the scare finally wore off, and so the fact remains that we cannot have any really good form of government anywhere until we take complete charge of the government at Washington. We can never be successful in our own struggle either until we have gained the throne of power and recognized our mothers, wives and sisters as one-half of the human family and given them a voice in the affairs of government.

Now I agree with Comrade Wilson from California. We should thank this committee for their work, and not go to the expense of scattering literature opposed to this commission form of government all over the United States; but as he said, put out the scientific principles of Socialism and go after them until we capture the whole thing. Let us get a governor that represents the working class, elect a president that represents the working class. And when the right time comes I want to have the pleasure of nominating a man to be the next president of this country. Mayor Seidel of Milwaukee, who will always represent the working class.

DEL. WHITEHEAD (Cal.): I have no presidential candidate to nominate. But I do wish to support this motion in favor of the commission which is practically the same amount as the amendment offered by Le Seidel, and against the amendment offered by Seidel. The comrades over here and for this reason: We should not attack the report of this committee; it is tentative; they make no positive recommendations. By adopting this report we can circulate it merely as a matter of information among the locals, and the comrades throughout the country. At the present time I am on a committee of fifteen in the city of Los Angeles where I want to know all I can of this commission form of government. After reading a great deal about the commission form of government and listening to addresses from those who were familiar with it I became a convert to its cause. I will say that we were the first city to inaugurate the initiative, referendum and recall which we have used. I will say to you that the friends of the committee of Los Angeles now is controlled by our people, the right people, and we are getting up the most progressive city charter that there is in the country today.

One or two other points: How will this be against us? I can imagine how for a short time the commission form of government may work to our disadvantage as a party organization, but I am firmly convinced that after two years—or four at the outside—in any community that it will be to the advantage of the Socialist movement; this commission form of government. Not only that; it is a step forward, a step toward the ultimate and final goal that we are all working for; and we as Socialists cannot afford to stand in the way of a real progressive movement until we have something better to offer. In the meantime while this report contains no specific recommendations we can take it simply as the findings on the facts of the case at their disposal. And then we add that while we are neither endorsing nor opposing the commission form of government, we appoint this committee of nine or whatever it may be to still further investigate and report in two years hence, or at some other time, favor the original motion; and I am certain

tainly against the amendment last offered. DEL. SPARGO (Vt.): I favor the motion to adopt the report and continue the committee. I am also strongly in favor of the recommendation made by Comrade Whitehead, namely, that we should not carry on an anti-commission form propaganda; and so place the national party on that side of the question at this time. I believe the commission form of government is as inevitable in politics as is the trust in industry. I believe that the opposition to the commission form of government per se is just as senseless in the realm of politics as is the opposition to the trust in the realm of industrial development. I desire to say that when our good friend and comrade from Georgia Dr. Stedman, was in this country including the commission form of government, he told me that as the result of his study from the Socialist point of view he believed it would tend to work to the advantage of the Socialist Party; and that we ought to support it.

A DELIGATE: A point of order. The whole question of commission government is not under discussion. THE CHAIRMAN: The point of order is not well taken. Comrade Spargo is speaking to the motion and amendment before the house.

DEL. SPARGO: I spent some time in the city of Spokane, where they have the commission form of government in its most advanced and perfected form. I attended several sessions of the municipal administrative body, and I say to you that after that experience and having in my mind my own experience with municipal government elsewhere, it seemed to me it was working not only more efficiently as an administrative machine, but that it was capable of much more service to the working class than the ordinary ward politician huckstering, tricky style of administration found under the common form of political administration.

I do want to ask the comrades in this convention not to go on record against the commission form of government; and to prevent this anti-commission propaganda and agitation I leave it to the comrades in their respective localities to decide their attitude regarding the specific form of commission government that is proposed for their community. In that respect I believe that the report of our committee as laid before us is a model of wisdom, and might well be copied by all other committees that are elected or appointed here.

DEL. MCCRELLIS (Ia.): I am a resident of Des Moines. I am familiar with the celebrated Des Moines plan. I have observed its workings for about four years, and I want to speak against the amendment of Comrade Slobodin, that this convention should express itself one way or the other. I am very well convinced that this convention should not express itself against the commission form of government, but whether or not it should express itself in favor depends upon the information given at the convention. I am a little in doubt whether it should.

As to the non-partisan features, and its affect upon the Socialist movement I will say this: we have just passed through a municipal campaign in Des Moines. It is true that we were compelled to drop our party name when we were on the ticket, but we were not compelled to lose our identity. When we went into the primary campaign there is where we won our fight because we did not expect to get through the primary and I will say that we did

secure a larger and better hearing than we ever did before in the city of Des Moines and a larger and better hearing than I believe it was possible to have secured under the ward system. Or under the party name. Why? Because on the old line we would have had to form our own meetings; Socialists would have held Socialist meetings; the democrats would have held democratic meetings; and the republicans and we have called republican meetings; and we would not have had a hearing before either the republican or democratic meetings. But under the non-partisan plan we got a hearing before the people in general. And we had this advantage. Our candidates like all others, went as a solid force the people. But we went as a solid compact body backed by our organization; and we carried on our campaign by constructive methods. One of our candidates at one meeting would present one phase of a subject, and another would take it up where he left off, and present another phase; and this gave us an advantage over where he found all the other candidates amusing Socialism before the campaign was taking place. That was one of the advantages. But there was a disadvantage, too. I remember that just a day or two before the campaign closed there were men who came to our committee and wanted to know who the Socialist candidates were. That is a disadvantage. We lost our identity as Socialists. Then the question is this: So far as I am concerned, is the advantage that we get from the greater and better hearing overbalanced by the disadvantage of losing our identity when we go on the official ballot? I don't believe it is. I want to supplement and emphasize it. I want to say that the comrades from North Dakota and the comrades from California who say that the Socialist Party is the only organization that can hold its identity under the commission form of government. But there is one thing that has not been touched upon here, and that is that the commission form of government in the municipalities is but an enticing wedge on the part of the bourgeois class I believe, to introduce the basic principle into our state and national governments and there I believe is a danger that we must look out for.

DEL. PATERSON (O.): I am opposed to the commission form of government for several reasons. One reason is that this is a reform movement; a substitute for Socialism especially adapted for advancement by the capitalist class in a community where there is no reform movement outside of the Socialist Party. When they build that up as one. The thing that the Socialist wants is class lines clearly drawn. They cannot be drawn by obliterating party lines.

I want to say further that some of the delegates who are on the floor of this convention today as representatives of the Socialist party in this convention, I find the honor of listening to when they were speaking for Mayor Jones, the non-reform candidate for mayor of Toledo. The commission form of government in Toledo. We don't need it. They took the precaution soon enough, and they adopted the non-partisan lines. They wiped out the identity of the Socialist candidates outright. Some of the delegates say that it makes everybody talk Socialism. They believe in Socialism without a party. Christianity without a Christ. That is what the com-

election form of Government. This form of Government is a good thing for Socialism. It is a very poor thing for Socialism. As a Socialist I don't want any substitute for Socialism. I don't want to support any candidate who promises simply to give us a "Good Government" or a "Clean Government" or a "business administration" or any of these other immediate demands. I want the capitalist vote opposed by a clean cut class conscious Socialist vote.

DIET. GAYLORD (Wis.): From my point of view there has been a confusion of ideas in this discussion. There has been an unnecessary separation in some cases because two ideas have been confused. As the commission form of Government has been presented to us it has been associated with two very distinct things. One is the non-partizan majority election. That is not an essential part of commission government at all. You could just as well elect a commission form of government with regular party ballot, and with your candidates regularly placed on party tickets. I feel that he clearly grasped.

The other idea is the election of a small group of administrative officers, with the responsible charge of the affairs of the municipality concentrated in a few hands. That is the commission form of Government. That is its essential principle. These few men hold in their hands all the powers usually given to government, including all those usually exercised by the department of public works, by the treasurer, the city clerk, and all the rest of them, the chief of police included; and this smaller group of men also hold the powers usually held by the city council, all these powers, legislative, administrative, and semi-judicial. All of these are in the hands of the commission. They act as one body. They do not act as checks and balances at all. It is all in one hand so to speak—all the powers of municipal government.

Now so far as the non-partizan feeling is concerned no socialist group in any city could be non-partizan if they were Socialists. Any political action that is intelligent is only the expression in political form of the interests of some social or economic group in Glasgow. When that is confessed the political action is intelligent. We have said that so many different ways in Milwaukee that they are beginning to see the truth of it there. Even the legislature came very near to admitting it at the last special session. They have tried to persuade us in Wisconsin, in Milwaukee, that it is not necessary to designate the principles of a candidate for municipal office; that it is entirely a matter of the man; entirely a matter of the intelligence of the voters in picking out the man. We pointed out that they were trying to obscure the great principles, the great issues of principle, which are not merely municipal principles, but which run from top to bottom of the Socialist political structure. And finally in a special session recently they did enact a non-partizan, municipal, majority election law for cities of over 10,000 people. It will make some progress, I think, the previous session they proposed and insisted but did not succeed—that there must be no designation of principles—and they passed a bill for the designation of principles. And they confine that designation of principles to five words. They must be words not used in the designation on the ballot, nomination paper, or election notice, for any state or national office. We have got to get different

words. We have thought of putting on the ballot these five words: "Workers of the world unite! for non-partizan occasion!" This non-partizan election. This makes it clear I trust that this tinkering with the election machinery for cities is not a necessary part of the commission form of government. That is the very thing that has been most of all insisted upon by our woazy friends up there in Milwaukee, the non-partizans—we call them the "woozies". That disposes of it seems to me, of the non-partizan, majority election feature. We are not opposed to the majority election. That part of it does bring out the class line. We are not opposing that, unless it does this: if the majority election may possibly result if it be in a place where there is not a normal majority—it may result in a most unwholesome combination of the most undesirable elements on one end and the equally undesirable Foofoogs at the other. Then you get a most horrible mess. I was in Los Angeles and the Foofoogs ran one end of the campaign and the saitoons and the dives ran the other. In Milwaukee we had the same thing. A combination of the red light district and the Foofoogs, and all that sort that come between. That is what you get when you force an abnormal majority where there is not a normal majority of those properly related to each other by economic connection. The class line is there, however, and sooner or later there must come ineffectual action along the lines fixed by economic interest; but for the time being it is liable to confuse the situation terribly.

As the commission form of government increasing economy and efficiency, you do not have to have the commission form of government in order to have efficiency. I will refer you to all sorts of men, authorities on that subject, who will say that the administration of Milwaukee—I am not going to make any nominating speech—the Milwaukee style of government, mayor, the old style council, chief of police, and all of that—nevertheless it furnished what is conceded to be if not the most efficient, certainly ranked among the most efficient forms of city government in this country. We made good. We showed what could be done in two years. But the commission form of government does make it more convenient for those to whom the power is given to do the things which they wish to do. No doubt about that. It simplifies matters. You don't have to have all the fustian, the red tape, the hocuspocus of council action, held in check by all that sort of thing. You get a simplified, more direct action. That is what you want. But we have here that the representative the city something to say through their special representatives in the common council, and gives them a chance to talk it over with the different elements, and with the different kind of folks there represented it seems to us that that has proved to be passably effective when intelligence enough is applied to that method. But I also want to say that I could—no, I could—but my Comrade Fran, say that I could—but my Comrade Fran, city attorney of Milwaukee, who is a lawyer, could draft such a form of commission government as would be utterly obnoxious to the goosegs and to the so-called reformers. And he could draft one that would be satisfactory to every socialist. The commission form of government can be anything you please. That is the point I wish to make about the commission form of government. Now in setting what shall be

the particular form of commission government the state in each case settling that. You will have to change the whole form of government in these United States before you can change that," and comrades. I don't propose to wait until we get the whole United States constitution fixed to suit us before we begin on the job of fixing the municipal government to suit us, we So-

DICK MALKIN (N.Y.): What are the specialists in this convention doing? We were the ones that said William Howard Taft was not fit to be president of the United States because he did not know what he was going to do. I say that our committees are not fit to be committees if after two years' study of this subject they are not ready to make any recommendations. What is this convention doing here? Why can't we get some recommendations as to what we should do about it? We have spent two and a half days here; two committees have reported so far, and neither one has brought in anything by which we could arrive at some decision. How in the world could we accept this report? What is there for us to accept? What more do we

KNOW THAT WE HAVE learned things for ourselves here to decide these things for ourselves. What are we going to do? Two years ago we elected committee; now we are going to spend days against electing committees, and then two years from now they will come again and tell us the same thing over again. So far as the non-partisan commission form of government is concerned I have had some experiences that are not as favorable as those of the comrades who spoke awhile ago. I have been in cities where the people were sick and tired of the graft of a democratic mayor. For years the democratic mayor fooled them and exploited them; then they elected a republican mayor and he did likewise. The ball kept rolling from side to side. So the people were tired of

all this they did not want any more republican or democratic mayors; but they wanted some solution of the problem than was facing them; finally the solution came in the commission form of government; and they gladly adopted it. They proposed a non-partisan ticket. The working class were delighted. At last the day of salvation had come. But let me tell you what

It happened. When the republicans had been elected, the democrats had stood outside the office the democrats had stood outside and told the people what the republicans were doing. When the democrats were in office the republicans likewise told the people what the democrats were doing. It was the people who were doing the work that way the people had some little idea how they were being robbed. Then finally came the commission form of government and then the democrats and the republicans made a contract together; they co-operated; they put up a non-partizan ticket; two democrats and two republicans and they were elected; and then there was peace for both the thieves were within; and the people did not know what was going on. That is where the people got the worst of it.

I have not studied this subject very much; I do not know very much about it, but I say that we elect committees to give us information; I say for God's sake let them come here and give us something definite to work upon instead of wasting our time. We can do better work than to sit around here.

DEL. HOGAN (Ark.): It seems to me that we as Socialists as reasonable men and women should be able to see the inevitable. The commission form of government is here; it is steadily growing whether

er we want it or not. It is coming in the recognition of this fact: there is no longer in our municipalities a line upon which the two old parties can divide. The commission form of government is a business proposition. It is a business administration of the business of the municipality, in which all the people, though they be republicans, though they be democrats, though they be Socialists, all the people are interested. A comrade over here declares the idea of bettering the condition of the municipality where he lives. As for me I desire to see every city in the land better; every city in the United States better; its affairs better administered in the interest of economy, in the interest of public health, in the interest of the people; and every one ought to be there in these things the citizens and I want to make this commission form of government the most interested form of government. It is the rock-staple in municipal government; it is inevitable; we cannot escape it; and we have to meet the issue as it is, and say that we will do all that we can to make it perfect. That is all.

DELL BREWER (Kas.). There is cer-

tainly some confusion here this afternoon on this question of the commission form of government. I know in my recent travels through the state of California that in many of the localities there was the same confusion among the comrades that I found here upon the floor of this convention. I have found the same true in almost every community that I have been during the past four or five months. Socialists everywhere are asking the same questions that are asked by the majority of the delegates here. Is the commission form of government a good thing or not? Now so far as I am personally concerned I can only speak from the point of view of regard, which has the commission form of government. In a recent election in that little city where the class lines were not so distinctly drawn, we Socialists did not lose our identity. The fact is that good government candidates of the republican and democratic tickets combined, that the street walkers and dive keepers, the Methodists, the Presbyterians, the Baptists and the Catholics, the whole of the repre-

representatives of capitalism, went to the ballot box on election day and voted for the "good government" candidates, as against the working class candidates nominated by the Socialists, and endorsed and supported by the working class generally in that community. Following the election of course the good government candidate of course the church bells were rung, and there were bonfires on the street corners and there was a tremendous jollification. To my mind there is one point in the commission form of government that is of vital importance in Kansas we have a law that requires in cities of the first class a certain percentage of the voters to sign a recall; that in cities of the second class there shall be a larger percentage; and in cities of the third class it is almost impossible for us to get that recall. Now these questions should all be considered; they should be analyzed. So chairmen have to meet these questions in every state in the Union. You should discuss them; you should be ready to advise the comrades intelligently. It seems to me very clear that where you have a proper right of recall that this commission form of Government is not so bad a thing as some of the comrades seem to think. Now for my part I feel that the committee has absolutely failed to perform its duties a

DEL HICKNEY (Tex.): wish at the very outset to correct a statement made by another delegate. God Almighty had absolutely nothing to do with the Galveston flood or the commission form of government. The fact of the matter is that Galveston would not be where it is except for a bunch of speculators. The hurricane arose and the waves came in from the ocean and the terrific catastrophe occurred, and then there was \$10,000,000 needed to build a gigantic stone wall to keep out the waves of the Atlantic. It is a fact that just before the storm the most corrupt administration in any city of its size in America was in power in Galveston, and so that they might not swipe the \$10,000,000 and keep the wall from being built, the capitalists of Galveston formed the first commission form of government. That is how it happened. Since that time we have had a lot of experience with the commission form of government, which has spread over the state that I represent, Houston. We have heard Houston is so inefficient. We have heard Houston is so inefficient in its police, so far reaching in its mendacity in its courts, so far reaching in its extravagance, so far reaching in its every detail that the powers that be on the commission have even decided the capitalists here that shall be sold by the breadstuffs in the red light district. Dallas proscribes in the commission form of government, the planters of the city of Dallas, in a day cornered right last year, ran a ticket-ment is non-partisan. The city government is non-partisan to the extent that the First National Bank and the Standard Oil Bank are at the same time the government in Dallas, Texas. If you go along the line you will find that the Marxian position is absolutely correct, and that government under capitalism is the executive committee of the ruling class. (Applause.) Consequently, all this talk of good administrators, nice administrations, is so much leather and prunell, so much poppycock, so much idiocy. The commission form of government enables the capitalist class to purchase five commissioners instead of fifty aldermen (applause), and from the standpoint of the ruling class, of course they are efficient, the most efficient thing that you can possibly imagine. But these five can order the police to club the strikers to death just as quick and just as efficiently as under the old plan. I am going to close by making this point, which is fundamentally, and I want to see more of it. It is this: That this national convention has absolutely nothing to do with the commission form of government. (Applause.) We are not dealing with states. (Applause.) We are not dealing with states. We are dealing with time. I believe, for information within the states on that point, Senator Gaylord was absolutely correct. Why should you bother about a city form of government? We are dealing with national affairs in this national convention, and in the cities we will look that efficiency form of government to the states.

To give the previous question was then ordered.

I was moved by Del Goebel (N. J.) that the rule be suspended and that on the

DEBBERYN (H): The discussion here has been of great interest. The Socialist party is organized for the purpose of helping the working class to get their public power in their own hands. The Socialist party is organized to gather the working class together to emancipate itself from the rule of the capitalist class. The capitalist class see the "handwriting on the wall" and at once they come and masquerade and say that in this country the best men in office, the best men, and the best men will be halleluiah. Non-partisanship! Why, we are the very essence of partisanship. We have got to be, we must, we can help the representatives of the class which they represent, and we ought to observe it and do it ourselves. You dare not designate yourself, and some comrade here from Lyons has found great beauty in that. And say the great joke of it is what I heard him say to my amazement, that they had them all talking Socialism before the campaign was over. That didn't tickle me. Were they all talking about the abolition of the wage system? I am an initiative and referendum man, subordinate to the main principle of the abolition of capitalism. I am an immediate demander as a means to the realization of our main principle. But the other fellows can steal all the planks of the immediate demands and still they will not be talking Socialism; understand that. (Applause.) Good government, good administration? I wish some of you boys could have read one of the last letters that Fredrick Engels wrote, showing how the capitalist would do this very thing that is embodied in the very idea of the commission form of government, on account of the expense of running the capitalist machine. For the business committee to conduct their business will become expensive; and they will have to reduce the cost. Look here; I am not a young chicken; they can fool me with this. I remember when I was in the Civil War they were in New York City before the Civil War they were in a pretty good. There were sixteen aldermen and twenty-four councilmen, and as a number. They were known as the "Forty Thieves." (Laughter.) That was their designation. "Forty Thieves." And on we had the "tyred ring" and there were only one. They got there just the same, and with its concentrated power representing the interests of the capitalist class, will remove the Master, and the servant will demand his pay. We working people, whenever they desire to hamper us by legislation, we cannot stop them. All our vituperation against or for the commission form of government won't help it one way or the other. What we want is to gather the working people together, to do like they did in Milwaukee. Milwaukee has more glory today in its hour of momentary depression than ever it had. It is made clear the class struggle, clearer than it. Sen. was before, and they understand it. Senator Gaylord made that clear to you. We can stand anything that capitalists will do. Remember, when the capitalist legislation enacts the commission form of government it is not in the interest of the working class. It is in the interest of the capitalist class, and the perpetuated class will take care of their interests. We have to

few of those who have spoken have done the committee the honor to read carefully the report. That would be natural, because there has not been a day in which to do it. Many of the arguments that have been presented here have been gone over carefully by that report. If there was no other reason for continuing the discussion than this, that it would give you all a chance to go over that document, which represents the careful and persistent work of the committee during our busy lives for two years, it would be justified. I think we ought to resent the implication coming from two or three of the speakers, that this committee has done nothing or said nothing. Read that report. (Applause.) Now, I want to say that of course there is no time now to discuss the questions and the arguments that are brought up, but I just want to make one or two things clear before we have to vote. First, the committee, I believe, would not favor the amendment to the amendment offered by Comrade Sloan to have another committee elected by the national committee. Let us take care of that thing right here, if we decide to have the committee continue. Second, the committee, I am sure, would approve and would accept the amendment that was offered by some one over here, because the amendment is exactly our position. Furthermore, the committee have just had a little talk with Comrade Wilson. Comrade Wilson's position, that he tried hard and had ten minutes to get over to you, is exactly the position the committee takes, and it is this: Here is the position. Here is the question regarding municipal government. It is an intricate question. It appears in different forms in different States and cities in the country. You cannot grasp it and just without it, "and you have say," "we are against or for it." You have got to discriminate in your judgment. And, comrades, what we want is this: We do not want the convention—we do not want members of the convention—the few of us that are here—to thrust the party into a position against the committee, the party as government, or for it, and an opportunity well as ourselves have had an opportunity to study and digest the facts, all of them that bear on this subject, in a former convention—I think it was four years ago—when you thrust the party into a certain position on a question, and reversed you. Now, months the referendum and what committee what we want and what the committee urges upon the convention, and what Comrades Wilson was trying to get across to you, and what the comrades over here has in mind, all agreeing with us, is this: That here is a subject that we want to give thorough study to in order that we may force on to the type of commission form of government, if there is such a type, which the Socialist movement can approve, adopt and stand for, and one that will be for the working class. (Applause.) Now, that is about all that we want, and I believe we can perhaps come to an agreement on that position. That is what we want.

DEL. SLOBODIN: I have a subject that has the latest study of any Socialist committee in America, and I move that the committee who have so ably presented this discussion of the commission form of government be continued, to bring in a report to the next national convention or congress of the Socialist party on the commission form of government. (Seconded.)

DEL. SMITH (Utah): Will this pamphlet that has been issued on this subject be published in good shape to be distributed in the various states if they want it?

DEL. THOMPSON: Yes.

DEL. SLOBODIN (N. Y.): I rise to a point of order. The convention has just now decided that the question of commission form of government is a state matter. Therefore, let us not meddle with it. You cannot blow hot and cold. You cannot decide that it is a state matter and then publish literature on the subject nationally.

THE CHAIRMAN: The chair does not know how to rule on that point, but I will leave it to the convention. The subject expressed in the vote on the continuance of the committee. The vote of the committee. The vote All in favor of continuing—

DEL. SLOBODIN: I move to amend that a committee of five be elected by this convention to take up that subject.

THE CHAIRMAN: The chair will entertain the amendment and we will have discussion upon it.

DEL. SLOBODIN: Just as I was saying, we have presented a report with one recommendation from the committee and then it comes out that the commission form of government, Comrade Thompson wishes to continue the matter and that is also to continue of the other delegates. Then the position of amendment that the commission form of government is a state matter. I want to speak against that, and I want to speak against this form of government. I am not in favor of continuing the committee for that reason. The comrade who made the amendment gave away the entire issue. The commission form of government means that any municipality may have an appointive executive committee that shall have the right of legislating and also certain other powers. I do not want the convention to elect a committee to do something which I am opposed to. Now, the thing to do would be to elect a state commission, and that is what they want to do on the short ballot. They hope to have a state committee instead of having a national committee. They should have the commission for the purpose of giving the state an appointive executive and judges, officers also, and having legislative powers. The third step would be to have the commission for the same purpose. Now, that is against the position of the International Socialists and against the position that ought to be taken by Socialists all

AFTERNOON SESSION, MAY 14, 1932

New York, recommending money to be
pursued by Socialists in office. Referred to
Committee on Resolutions.
Resolution signed by Iowa delegation, on
the subject of the liquor traffic. Referred
to Committee on Resolutions.
Resolution signed by Delegates J. Osool,
Patrick Mahony and Robert Lawrence, of
Massachusetts, in delegation protesting
against the Dillingham Immigration Bill
and the Root amendment. Referred to
Committee on Resolutions.
Resolution introduced by Delegate Mary
O'Reilly on opposition to military edu-
cation of children. Referred to Committee
on Resolutions.
Resolution submitted by Del. Geo. W.
O'Dam, of Missouri, that the party provide
a more substantial form of dues cards,
similar to that of the Western Federation
of Miners. Referred to Committee on Reso-
lutions.
Resolution on the subject of labor unions,
submitted under instructions by delegates
from Kings County, New York. Referred
to Committee on Resolutions.
The convention adjourned at 6 o'clock-
p. m.

FOURTH DAYS SESSION.

Del Otto F. Branstetter, chairman of the preceding day, called the convention to order at 10 o'clock a. m. Nominations for chairman of the day were called for, and the following were made:

Lee (N. Y.)—accepted.
 Slayton (Pa.)—accepted.
 Collins (Colo.)—accepted.
 Carey (Mass.)—declined.
 Lattimer (Minn.)—declined.
 Geibel (N. J.)—accepted.
 Thompson (Tex.)—declined.
 Barth (Wash.)—accepted.
 The vote resulted as follows: Lee 72, Slayton 48, Collins 34, Geibel 21, Barth 21, Del. Algeron Lee, of New York, was declared elected chairman for the day.
 The following nominations were made for vice chairman of the day:

S. Slater (Ky.)—absent.
 Lockwood (Mich.)—accepted.
 Houston (W. Va.)—declined.
 Le Stneur (N. D.)—accepted.

The vote resulted: Sadler 72, Le Stneur 87, and Del. Le Stneur was declared elected vice chairman for the day.
 Del. Stobodin, of New York, announced his withdrawal as a candidate for the Committee on Education, and requested the delegates to strike his name from the ballots.

PERSONAL PRIVILEGE.

DEL. BARNES (Pa.): Comrade Chairman, I rise to a question of personal privilege. Yesterday Comrade Haywood inserted a subject during my absence, and I would like to have a few moments to set the facts of that matter before the convention. The incident that gave rise to the question of personal privilege enjoyed by Comrade Haywood which by a vote of the convention was decided not to be read. I was acting as chairman. My personal opinion was that the communication should be read, but I was not governed by my personal opinion and left it to the option of the assembly. Afterward I was decided in favor of the telegram. However, the description of the nature of the communication when it was announced that it came from a Branch in Denver and asserted the rights of a member of the convention, and when it was later explained that it was not a regular member of the convention, but one to whom the courtesy of a voice had been granted by the convention, 90 per cent of the delegates, I am sure, knew whom it referred to, and in a few minutes after I think 100 per cent of the delegates and all the newspaper men knew whom it referred to. Almost immediately after that our comrade secretary came to me and said, "The newspaper men are very much agitated on this subject and there will probably be large headlines in the papers tomorrow about suppression of documents and mystery in the Socialist convention," and he transmitted their request that they

might see that without publishing it, just the nature of it, in order to color their story. And I believe we conferred upon it, and we believed that it would be a good idea, putting them on their point of honor that they might see it, when they knew that the decision was not to publish. Comrade Haywood yesterday said that the telegram "appeared in the Indianapolis Star this morning." That is quite a rash statement, when there is just this sentence and nothing more appearing in the Star: "Haywood is charged with conduct unbecoming a Socialist." This thing moved Comrade Haywood to enlarge on his ideas and make, in my judgment, an unwarranted attack upon persons not interested or involved in the question at all. That, however, is his own concern. It seems to me it was a case of much-ado-about nothing. The reporters respected their honor in every respect. Everybody knew that one sentence uttered in the Indianapolis Star was charged with conduct unbecoming a Socialist. Those are the only published words that are in all in the telegram, so that the statement of Comrade Haywood is quite incorrect. It may be possible that it was an error of judgment on my part, but the purpose as I have explained, was to prevent a mystery being spread over the nation in large headlines and advertising a misconception of the purposes of the convention. I thank you, comrades. (Applause.)

REGULAR ORDER.

Del. Hartman, of California, stated that he had two telegrams from San Diego. The Chairman stated that they would be read under the order of communications.
 On motion of Del. Merrill (N. Y.), the reading of the minutes was dispensed with, the Chairman announcing that corrections desired might be handed to the Secretary, to be disposed of before the adjournment.

ADDRESS BY KARL LEGIEN, OF GERMANY.

THE CHAIRMAN: Comrades, at this point I would like to interrupt the regular order of business to introduce you to our comrade, Karl Legien, the Secretary of the General Federation of Labor Unions of Germany, and the only published words that are in all in the telegram, so that the statement of Comrade Haywood is quite incorrect. It may be possible that it was an error of judgment on my part, but the purpose as I have explained, was to prevent a mystery being spread over the nation in large headlines and advertising a misconception of the purposes of the convention. I thank you, comrades. (Applause.)

Del. Hartman, of California, stated that he had two telegrams from San Diego. The Chairman stated that they would be read under the order of communications.
 On motion of Del. Merrill (N. Y.), the reading of the minutes was dispensed with, the Chairman announcing that corrections desired might be handed to the Secretary, to be disposed of before the adjournment.

Comrade Legien then addressed the convention, being received with great enthusiasm. He spoke in German, after which his address was translated into English by the Secretary, Comrade A. Bunnmeister.

COMRADE LEGIEN: Comrades and fellow-workers: It gives me great pleasure to attend your convention while I am traveling in this country. I have not been specially delegated by the Executive Council of the German Social Democratic Party, because we had no idea, when I left Europe, that I would be able to see your convention at all.

I dare say, however, that I should all the same be entitled to speak on behalf of our party and also on behalf of its Executive Council, not only because I am one of the representatives of the German Social Democratic Party in our Reichstag, but also on account of the fact that I am the President of the German Federation of Trade Unions, and for this reason in constant touch with the Executive Council of the Socialist party of Germany. (Applause.)

As a matter of fact, the Socialist movement of our country is closely and with much interest watching the movement in the United States; partly because it is largely believed that the United States may possibly be or become the first nation of practical Socialism (applause) and growth of the rapid concentration and growth of capitalism and open to the workers of this country. But to believe that the labor movement of the New World, to some extent at least, depends also on the development of our movement in Europe, not merely on account of our modern means of communication, but also because the Socialist movement is international and its final aims can only be realized on an international basis.

As far as I know, from the temper of this convention, from reports published in your press, and also from prominent members of the party, you will have to decide most delicate and important questions, problems which have for years taken up all our time in the German movement.

You will be called upon, for instance, to find a solution with respect to the relations which should exist between the party and the trade union movement, and these relations, of course, must be in accordance with the actual economic condition and with the development of both wings of the labor movement in every country.

At least as far as Germany is concerned, I may say without hesitation that we have been able to solve this all-important question, not only to the benefit of our own movement, but I believe also to the benefit of the whole labor movement. I cannot give a description of my own as to what should be done in your particular case, and I can do so to give you an idea of what we did in Germany under similar circumstances, leaving you to draw parallels if you desire.

Trade unions had been in existence in Germany before we had any Socialist movement at all. While others were established at the same time as the political party, some of these unions started through the direct influence of members of the Socialist party while many unions were also established by factions of the party that existed in Germany from the 60's up to 1876. But all of these organizations, whether or not under the influence of the party, help the trade unions to keep aloof from party politics (applause), believing that they should unite the working class of all shades and faiths in opposition to modern capitalism, which has no regard to political parties or religious beliefs.

This principle had been endorsed at a Trade Union Congress in 1872, and also at the joint conference of both wings of the trade unions, which was held in 1876, immediately after both Social Democratic parties had been merged. After that the movement had made rapid progress, but they were brutally suppressed in 1878 by means of the infamous anti-Socialist law.

to favor the sending of the telegram. Is it
want to know just where we are at. Is it

*The report is printed in exte-
O.—Editor.

fully as possible between the two sides to a question. That leaves it to the discretion and knowledge of the Chairman as to the side on which the delegate desires to speak. If he keeps a list and a large crowd rushes up with their names, the Chairman must grant the floor in rotation and the side that speaks and then someone on that side will rise when his name is called and move the previous question.

DEL. RINGLER (Pa.): I move as an amendment that in sending names to the Chair the delegate shall designate the side on which he wishes to speak and the Chair shall select alternately one from each side until the time arrives at which the vote must be taken.

DEL. MADONEY (Mass.): Supposing I am on neither side?

THE CHAIRMAN: I can not answer that question.

DEL. SOLOMON (N. Y.): The purpose of the motion is to prevent the calling for the previous question. The rules provide that not more than four hours shall be allowed for discussion on any question. This means that whenever a delegate arises whose name is on the list he can move the previous question and you are in the same position that you were before.

DEL. BRESNAHER (Ohio): I want to speak against the motion because it will be very easy to get a large number of names to be placed in the list in such a way that some of the delegates will talk fifty times on this floor before they get away and others would not have a chance to present their views at all. I want to say right now that I am opposed to anything of that kind, and that I am opposed to any states being arranged for certain ones who have charge of this convention. I want this convention to be left open, and absolutely free. I am opposed to anything being fixed up so that some may get favors.

The previous question was then moved and seconded.

DEL. COSGROVE: I want to speak in support of my motion.

THE CHAIRMAN: After the previous question is put the Chair will be compelled to give you the floor in closing. If you desire it, but I hope the discussion will be as short as possible.

The previous question was then ordered. DEL. COSGROVE: The idea that I had in view was this, that the names will be received in rotation as presented. I don't think that any one is going to present his name a dozen times until those who have presented them previously have had an opportunity to present their views. It is no opportunity to suppress any discussion, nor to suppress any name so that he may at any time call for the previous question. The motion states that all comrades presenting their names should have the opportunity to speak before the previous question is put.

DEL. KELLEY (N. J.): I understand the object in making this motion, but it is really unnecessary under the rules. Yesterday the debate on the commission form of government the rules were not strictly enforced. If the Chairman will enforce the rules it will be unnecessary to have a list of speakers sent up here. You have four hours talk on every subject that comes up for discussion. I know in the Workers' Sick and Death Benefit Fund they kept a speakers' list, and the last convention continued thirteen days owing to such a rule. Let the Chairman enforce the spirit of the rule which is to divide the time as nearly as possible, which he can do very readily

by asking the delegate on which side he wishes to speak and recognizing each side in rotation. This will accomplish the object of the comrade from New Jersey and at the same time will not make it impossible for us to get through with our business in the time that we have fixed.

THE CHAIRMAN: It is moved and seconded that the rules be suspended, and that it be provided that in the discussion of reports delegates desiring the floor shall send their names in writing to the Chairman; that the Chairman shall keep a list of such names and that the Chairman shall recognize the delegates in the order in which their names have been received; and that when the previous question has been carried all those whose names are at that time upon the list shall nevertheless have the right to speak before the vote is taken.

DEL. HOGAN (Ark.): I rise to offer an amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN: No amendment is in order. All in favor of suspending the rules will say aye. Those opposed, no.

DEL. HOGAN (Ark.): I offer the following motion. That the previous question shall not be ordered until an opportunity has been given an equal number of the speakers upon either side of the proposition under discussion to present their views.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair rules that motion out of order for the reason that it is impossible to demand of a Chairman authoritative knowledge whether a man is speaking for or against a proposition. Our rule states that so far as possible the Chair shall recognize both sides equally, but you can not make a rule that an equal number of persons shall be heard on each side. The report of the Auditing Committee will be presented.

The report of the Auditing Committee was then read.

To the National Convention of the Socialist Party:

Comrades—We, your Audit Committee, beg to make the following report:

The books of the National Office are not at the convention, and it is not possible to make an audit at this time.

We find that the books from the preceding audit were audited on April 11, 1912, by the Paine and Bock Audit Company of Chicago, selected by the National Executive Committee, and we herewith submit their report with recommendations made by them.

AUDIT OF NATIONAL OFFICE FINANCES.

Telephone Randolph 2592.
Telephone Automatic 62-422.
PAINE & BOCK AUDIT CO.,
Not Inc.

Public Accountants and Auditors,
Commercial National Bank Building,
Chicago, Adams and Clark Sts.

546 Chicago, April 25, 1912.

National Executive Committee, The Socialist Party, Chicago, Ill.
Gentlemen—In accordance with your instructions we have audited the books of the National Office of the Socialist Party for the period September 1, 1911, to April 1, 1912, and submit herewith, as of April 1, 1912:
General Ledger Trial Balance, National Office Statement of Assets and Liabilities, National Office General Ledger Trial Balance, Lyceum Department Statement of Assets and Liabilities, Lyceum Department all of which we hereby certify to be correct

MORNING SESSION, MAY 15, 1912

Our audit comprehended the following:
Verified Entries of Cash Received and Distribution of Same with Stubs of Secretary's Receipts.
Verified Entries of Cash Paid and Distribution of Same, with Cancelled Checks and Receipts for Expenditures.
Verified Footings of Cash Received.
Verified Footings of Cash Expenditures.
Verified Mortgage Reserve Fund in Separate Bank Account.
Checked Cash Book and Journal Postings to General Ledgers.
National Office cashier and Lyceum Department cashier on April 11, 1912, and found the same correct.

We made bank reconciliations under date of March 31, 1912, and found that the sum total of the checks outstanding, added to the balance shown by the cash books, agreed with the balances shown by the bank statements on that date, with the exception of the National Office account, which exceeded the bank balance by \$0.80. We suggest that the bank exchange be paid at the end of each month instead of daily as is your custom. The bank will charge your account with the exchange for the month, which can be verified with the pass book.

We recommend that a "petty cash" account be opened in the general ledger, containing same with a sufficient amount to constitute a working or petty cash fund; to be reimbursed from time to time by a check drawn covering O. K'd memoranda (disbursements), cashed and the fund restored to the original amount. We recommend that a regular form of pay roll book be used, the same to be approved at the time the same is to be approved. We further recommend that separate books be used for cash received and cash paid, which will facilitate the work and be less expensive than your present method. We also suggest that a date be fixed each year for the closing of the books.

We recommend that a book be used for the purpose of listing the furniture and fixtures and the cost. This book should be in agreement with the furniture and fixture inventory in the general ledger. A perpetual inventory of this kind will be very valuable in case of fire.

We also recommend that a more up-to-date system of billing be adopted in order to save time and expense.

Respectfully submitted,

PAINE & BOCK AUDIT CO.,
By H. S. Paine.

SOCIALIST PARTY, NATIONAL HEAD-QUARTERS.

GENERAL LEDGER TRIAL BALANCE,
APRIL 1, 1912.

Dr. Cr.
Lyceum Department, \$3,047.22
Mortgage Reserve Fund 9,285.89
Outstanding Accounts 1,819.09
Organizers 1,070.21
Cash, H. Kerr Co. \$ 161.25
Louis Kopeln Press
Bureau 340.00
Appropriations
Cash in Bank and on Hand 1,770.00
Subscription Cards 759.55
National Office 780.00
Subscription on Sub-
National Cards 120.00
National Dues 34,129.10
Printing and Sup- 2,830.99

ture, 1911 3,279.96
Printing, 1912 5,704.18
Literature, 1912 2,702.62
Buttons 174.21
Campaign Fund, 59.85
Furniture and Fix-
tures 1,809.63
National Executive 17.71
Committee
Express and Freight 847.45
Postage 1,563.42
Rent 2,336.14
Exchange 703.33
General Expense 65.70
Telegrams and Tele- 366.19
phone 285.31
Wages 2,633.36
Organizing 2,591.18
Donations and Collec-
tions
Discount 921.59
H. G. Adair 101.72
Empire Paper Com- 681.50
pany 4.00
A. B. Dick Company 24.30
B. W. Heubsch 1.35
Macmillan Company 1.26
James H. O'Neil Com-
pany 180.00
F. J. Kain & Son 322.50
P. F. Pattison & Co. 10.20
Partridge & Anderson 10.45
Saul Bros. 41.25
John F. Jordan 38.50
Sullivan-Blakey Com-
pany 2.25
Tremont Paper Mills 9.74
H. D. Stadeney 23.45
Store
Milwaukee Social Dem.
Club Company 47.75
Equity Series 12.50
The Elliott Company 1.10
Std. Card Appropri-
ation 50.00
Appropriation, Organ-
izing 3,106.28
Appropriation, Press 100.00
U. S. Express Com-
pany 353.19
Bague Stamp Works 1.75
Fisher-Hamilton Com-
pany 117.48
George H. Doran Com-
pany 1.29
J. W. Butler Paper
Company 15.09
Joshua Wanhop 30.00
Globe Engraving &
Charged Off Accounts 28.00
National Office, Net
Balance 15,255.78

\$67,051.35 \$67,051.35
SOCIALIST PARTY, NATIONAL HEAD-QUARTERS.

STATEMENT OF ASSETS AND LIABILITIES,
APRIL 1, 1912.
ASSETS.
Cash in Bank and on Hand \$ 7,596.55
Mortgage Reserve Fund 9,285.89
Outstanding Accounts 1,819.09
Subscription Cards 780.00
Stationery and Supplies 2,830.99
Literature 174.21
Furniture and Fixtures 1,809.63
Lyceum Department 8,047.22
Organizers 1,070.21
\$31,243.75

[illegible]

67

PROGRAM

The motion was seconded.

Ten years ago I said—and I said

Sum.

III. We are now confronted with

WE awoke to it

We say that if you take out the sne

I believe the Soc

The other items are on the whole self-

A DETEGATTE. They are

pent thousands and thousands of dollars

58

the working class, of the entire human race.

Comrades, we stand today at the parting of the ways. We are making tremendous strides in our march toward the future. The only road that capitalism has to sweep back the millions from the abyss of poverty is by turning up the tide of revolution in the farm-to-rolling tide of the workers of the farm. To defeat them they are appealing; to them they are offering everything that capitalism can offer to stay on the backs of the workers. We must go to the farmer and show him that he can not be relieved while he is being ridden by the capitalist class and that we alone come to him with the gospel of freedom, of liberty, of emancipation, of social ownership, of everything necessary to the production of wealth and the satisfaction of life.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN: The hour of 1 o'clock having arrived, the convention stands adjourned.

N SESSION.

AFTERNOON SESSION

small occupants. We must distinguish between those two points. The Socialist party is a party of the working class. I does not undertake to relieve the burden of all classes of society. However, we take

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION.

of all classes or sections of the population. If that there are some classes that win suffer. What the farmers may want in another State they may not want in one county the State they may want in Mexico they may reject in another. In the

demand communism. They would reject that proposition in any country they would stand for small nations. In one country they would stand for small nations and in another country they would stand against it. In one there might be one thing proper and in another something different. Therefore, a policy should be adopted that is consistent. We are dealing with principles, and not with a principle. Communism must contain only the

FARMERS' PROGRAM

A phrase the Socialist party uses to carry out its demands upon the working class party is that they are not the small farmers, grocers and not the big farmers, whether of any stratum of society. We must distinguish between form of ownership and forms of tillage. Those forms of ownership are entirely different. The form of ownership may be state or national, but the form of tillage must adapt itself to the means of production and the distribution to the use and the form of the confused

at this point, the platform. In reply to

DEL. I do not want to interrupt the comrade who is speaking, but since I have the first of the amendments, I will make it. I have the first of the amendments, I will make it. I have the first of the amendments, I will make it.

that must unopposed be adopted, then we will discuss it. I am sure that the comrades will discuss it with me and I will be glad to speak on such plank as is under discussion. If the amendment is defeated, then this general argument will be in order.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is Comrade Merrin willing to accept the substitute?

[illegible]

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN: The convention
having arrived, the convention
stands adjourned.

CON SESSION.

small occupants. We must divide the Socialist party into those two points. The Socialist party is a party of the working class. I do not undertake to relieve the burden of all classes of society. However, we take it that there are some classes who want to suffer. What the farmers may want in one State they may want in another State. What they may want in Mexico they may reject in another land. In the demand confiscation reflect that proposition country they would stand for small

[illegible]

THE CHAIRMAN: IN

The motion was put and carried.

DELY. OHSOL:

The first clause, because it leaves out the peasants, is impossible to own socially. Those big storage plants, those means of transportation. If you do not own the land itself upon which those storage plants and other means are erected. That is one thing. The other thing is that if the farmers own the land, they are supposed to produce for subsistence only, not for the market. That is the possibility to keep the occupant out of competition with the large world market. Agriculture, out of the large world market, as you produce for the market, those means of transportation you have to have some control over them, and you introduce co-operative action. That is the only possible way to govern the land. As a matter of fact all the parties have come to that view. The German Socialist party started to debate on the agrarian question in 1870 and from time to time till 1908, when it was postponed. The only recommendation which has been brought out thus far was that of Comrade Kautsky at one of the various German Socialist assemblies, that the land should be owned by the state. If you take the present state you cannot possibly leave any private ownership of land, and for that reason the small farmers in Germany and elsewhere have become bankrupt. For that reason they have not been able to pay with the machinery owned by the large land owners. In the second place, they have become deprived of those bankers who advanced them money under mortgages, and those mortgages can now be taken by application to the State at a lower percentage, and thus the farmer can be relieved of large payments he has heretofore had to pay to private owners of capital or bankers.

The next recommendation which has been thus far advanced is the abolishment of all

DEL. MORG.
the second now

...OTTO. ...

first section, which means transportation and storage, and it means that you have to confine yourselves either to land owners or land tenants. Now, if you introduce such a form of ownership you will have to have tenants of the State and you will have to care for them. You can supervise and lay down the conditions of tenantry, either 30 years or more. You can lay down conditions of tillage of the soil, but as soon as you do you introduce an actual form of ownership. So you leave this to them, or you do not use of anything out land from all other means of production? Small stores and small shops are also tools of production in the stage of tenantry. The same machinery, trust, for instance, the United States Shoe Machinery Company, which is actually the same thing which happens with the land. Therefore I say let us adopt such a policy as will better the condition of those who till the soil—not the farm owners, but the farm laborers. (Applause.)

DEL. CASSIDY (N. Y.): Yesterday when we discussed a question it appeared that someone who spoke had no special knowledge of the subject. I trust that today only those who are real farmers and who have made some special study of this subject will talk on the question. I am a printer by trade and a city worker. I believe the subject is one of the most intense interest and greatest significance to the Socialist movement. Now, as a printer and a city worker, I want to get the inside facts. I want to realize its importance, and I trust that the co-operators and stenographers and all others who have no real knowledge on the subject will keep silent. (Applause.)

DEL. WILLIS (OKLA.): I want to speak against the adoption of that report of the committee in its present form. I am an actual farmer. I must say that I am impatient the committee for bringing in such a laborate report, and I will say this, that with few exceptions I have very little to say against it. But in its present form I agree with the Comrade who has just spoken, that it is necessary to mention that we distinctly demand the collective ownership of land. (Applause.) The Oklahoma delegation feels that this question would have been discussed in a much better manner if this subject had been referred to a

DEL. GATES: I think it would have a tendency to facilitate business if we had a committee elected to compose of say four or five farmers—believe I am the only one of our delegation—to confer with this committee. It might save a great amount of trouble, if I believe, and we could get away from discussion, and in a better way than position before this body in an amendment. Therefore, I move you an amendment that we appoint a committee of five farmers, that we delegate to this convention, to confer with this committee and bring in a report as soon as possible. (Seconded.)

THE CHAIRMAN: At this convention?

THE CHAIRMAN: A committee of five
composed of farmers.
The previous question was ordered, and
the vote was carried.
The following nominations for this com-
mittee were made, all of the delegates
named accepting:

Wells, of Oregon.
Sherman, of Rhode Island.
Theibert, of Minnesota.
Nash, of Idaho.
Beloit, of Texas.
L. L. Rhodes, of North Dakota.
Grent, of Pennsylvania.
Caldwell, of Idaho.
Coonrod, of Idaho.

THE CHAIRMAN: I would like you to nominate only actual farmers who have been successful in business. The Chair takes it that every delegate has heard of Mr. Del Hillquit, who has accepted as an actual farmer at the present time because that was the nature of the motion. There are nine candidates of the motion. There are nine members. Del Hillquit moved that the nine stand as the committee. Seconded. Ines carried.

THE CHAIRMAN: The convention is now referred a certain matter to the National Executive Committee with instructions to report this afternoon. In the report of the National Executive Committee on that subject takes precedence of the regular order of business. The Chairman for the National Executive Committee has the floor.

Del Hartman, on presentation of the following report to the Executive Committee, and accompanying telegram and report and accompanying telegram.

REPORT OF THE NATIONAL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.

LIVE COMMITTEE.

The Executive Committee met in executive session. The San Diego situation was thoroughly discussed and the following action finally taken: A contribution of \$250 has been

st. A committee of the State Board of California for San Diego, partly of California on the situation here.

2nd. The Richardson has been circulated in A. J. Richardson's name, and an appeal for funds accompanying it.

3rd. We propose that the following be demitted at once to the Secretary of the American Committee of California Friends of California.

4th. That the American Committee of California

THE CHAIRMAN: If Comrade Harri-
man chooses to answer the inquiry he may
do so.

DEL. SADLER: Wasn't there another or-
ganization specified? You have only men-
tioned one.

DEL. HARRIMAN: They were all in the scraps, and the money that is sent out and the assistance that is solicited by the United States Federation of Labor, Building Trades Council and Socialist Party goes to San Diego to defend them all, no matter who.

DEL. KATIE SADLER: Then I would amend that we include a telegram to the Industrial Workers of the World, who are also in the fight. (Applause.)

DEL HAKKIMAN: There is also a telegram to be sent to the comrades in San Diego, stating what we have done. I suggest that that be incorporated in the report, that telegram be sent to the San Diego comrades stating to them what is our action.

THE CHAIRMAN: If there is no objection that will be considered included in the report.

DEL SADIER: I want that added.

understood. My amendment—that clearly THE CHAIRMAN: You have made what motion?

DEL. SADLER: I made an amendment that in the telegram be also included the Industrial Workers of the World.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Industrial Workers of the world; what department?

DEL. SADLER: At San Diego.

THE CHAIRMAN: What office? Do you

DEL SADDLE: The local organization will meet to the national organization or to the local organization at San Diego?

HARRISMAN: Yes.

DEL CHAIRMAN: The motion already provides for a telegram, as I understand it to a joint meeting of all the comrades in San Diego arranged. It does not distinguish the various branches.

DEL HARRISMAN: To San Diego, the

THE CHAIRMAN: To the San Diego Free Speech League.

DEL. HARRIMAN: That a telegram be sent to the Free Speech League at San Diego, which is a merged committee from all the organizations in the free speech fight.

THE CHAIRMAN: The I. W. W. is also in it. Are you ready for the question.

DEL. BEISSEMER (Ohio): I want to say

While that last clause that was put in there was that they be urged to co-operate with the organizations of the A. F. of L. Is that not correct? And in that case, you have recognized the A. F. of L. and have urged the organization that is working for the Spanish-American. So that we may know the facts, I will state that the Free Spanish League in San Diego is a League composed of Americans.

THE CHAIRMAN: The comrade asked Comrade Harman a question, and Harman is answering.

include name is right anyway. I don't care how much you agree. I insist that you comrades do recognize any movement within the working class. I want to say more, with I W W, the tool that by us ignoring the I W W, we do more to compel men-conviction here, we do more to compel men- because of our party to leave the movement, because there are many members of the party that say that we are cowards, that we are not direct-actionists enough. In the

getting the money, even as
it to us.

DEL. EDWARDS (Tex.): I am perfectly willing to have the committee rewrite that section, provided this group may be made clear. I believe if anyone will read the section as it is printed, and then remember some of the questions that are asked by the audience, you will see the necessity of making it clear. One of the questions asked will be, "Do you want to have a wagon and a corn crib socially owned and democratically administered?" Now, if of course, the committee did not mean that, and if the committee or the chairman will suggest some phrase that will just make it clear that we refer to such means of production and transportation as the delivery from New York has just mentioned, that will answer the purpose.

THE CHAIRMAN: The committee has accepted the amendments in substance. The exact wording of that amendment, I suppose will not be quibbled over between the different comrades, because it is understood, of course, that it is not strictly legal means that we refer to.

DEL. THOMPSON (Wis.): It has been stated that the committee accepted this amendment.

DEL. CHAIRMAN: It is accepted, considerably scattered. I am a member of the committee, and I do not want to accept that I think it would be bad policy to put that phrase in there. I simply want to correct a statement.

THE CHAIRMAN: If the committee does not agree to accept it, all right. I understood the committee accepted it.

DEL. WRIGHT (Neb.): Two years ago this committee was elected for the purpose of studying the problems of the agriculturalist, and for two years this committee, or most of them, have been studying this problem. As for myself, I have labored over this question until my head has ached. We find ourselves at this time not thoroughly educated in this great problem. The very fact that the great problem and every student of this great question have been waiting anxiously for the last census report and have not been able to get it, proves that to arrive at a complete understanding of the evolution of farm industry is as yet an impossibility. Every day some new force is making its appearance in connection with the evolution of agriculture. I have just been informed recently of this fact, which I dare say the average farmer has not taken into consideration, and perhaps does not know: That Europe is even alarmed over the possibility of not being able to get the usual food supply which Europe gets from American agricultural exports. I cite this fact to show that along with this hundreds of other fundamental problems are making their appearance. You cannot lay down a specific line of action in connection with those things which are yet in the hands of the agriculturalist and in the hands of the inventors, and which are as yet not seen or analyzed, not studied. American capital, as well as European capital is now competing to seize upon land, not because it used to be, and because the field of investment has been closed up, with the result that American has been discovered, civilized, and its civilization has been most to the limit. Now those who are hunting for an investment, and it is seeking hand as an outlet. Capital has been invented to take hold upon farming. The inventor's mind is being turned in the direction of improving farm methods; not due to the efforts of the farmer, but to the

prospect of dividends as seen by the manufacturing class, who use the inventor and scientist to further the ends of the capitalist class. Just exactly what the end of this course will be, I do not know; nobody knows. Only those things which can be analyzed up to this time can be dealt with. This report has not been thrown together in a haphazard manner. This report is just as complete as it can be, just as scholarly as it is possible to produce at this time. It reaches just as far as we are able to analyze the situation. I can understand very readily why one objection will come from one part of the United States, while an entirely different objection will come from another part. The new clause introduced leaves it open for the states in their state platforms to conform to the conditions of their particular sections. What we do require now, in view of the fact that we do see that the capitalist landlords, speculators and land grabbers seize an opportunity for manipulation, is that we must have a national declaration which aims a blow at this class of parasites, to get them off the farmer's back. We must have a national declaration which will involve the means of exploitation in manufacturing lines which reach the farmer. This you have got, and this declaration as to a national program covers every phase of this question that can possibly be dealt with intelligently, and the more we fuss with it, the worse you are going to make it, and we are likely to end up here with no program at all. But no matter how we end the discussion, there are a number of students of economics, that have been attracted to this question, they will study it, not for the next year, and will not for the next twenty years, and will all the time become clearer upon the matter as they forego their appearance.

DEL. TAYLOR (Ill.): I would like to ask for information whether this clause in regard to exploitation was suggested by the idea that this as it reads now would take in the individual wagon, the ownership of a wagon in which a man takes goods from his farm to the warehouse or the railroad.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair understands that that was the reason for making that amendment.

DEL. TAYLOR: Then I move as a substitute for the amendment that the word "social" be put before the word "means" in the first line of this clause; "the Socialist party demands that social means" and so forth.

DEL. OHSEL (Mass.): I have an amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Ohsel of Massachusetts moved that in the first line the word "land" be inserted so that it shall read, "The Socialist party demands that land and the means of transportation and storage," etc. This amendment will also be before the house.

DEL. SLOBODIN (N. Y.): Why do we demand the collective ownership, as in our platform, of the means of transportation, first, as a step to our final end, the collective ownership of all the means of production and distribution; and second, for the purpose of improving the condition of the workmen that work in the United States, is that the reason why the farmers report contains the demand for the social ownership of the means of transportation? Is the farmer interested in our final means of production himself? Is he interested in improving the condition of the

workmen who work on the railways? No, what is it that he is interested in first? He wants the means of transportation to be more efficient and cheaper. That is why that is included in the farmers' program, so that the farmer may get more efficient service and pay less for it. You see very readily that there is a conflict between the interests of the men who work on the railways and the interests of the small farmers who use those railways. The one demands the highest wages he can get, which means increase in the cost of transportation. The farmer demands a lower cost of transportation which eventually means less wages. They must reconcile the meaning and intent of our general program with the program laid down in this report. Why is it this farmers' program that has so forcibly stated that the farmer has about three million small tiller farmers, about the three or four million agricultural wage slaves? Why don't you say one word about the agricultural workers? There is not one word about that. Ten years ago this question was discussed and Delegate Simons agreed that he was wrong at that time, to take the same position. I remember that I opposed him at that time. I don't say the farmers' problem or that the agricultural problem is not of importance, but we have so many irons in the fire and the getting of the movement to the proletariat is so important that we are not ready to take up this agricultural problem. Let us first approach the wage slave. Let us get our message of Socialism to the agricultural workers, those that work on the farms, then when we have succeeded to some extent in that the next step will be to get the same message to the tenant farmers of America. If there is to be an agrarian program on the part of the Socialist party it should be addressed to agricultural workers and nobody else.

DEL. L. L. RHODES (Tex.): I wish to say that this farmers' program that is before the convention satisfies the people of the south. While I am sure that it will not help the people of the cities it will help us largely in advancing the cause of Socialism in the southland. We are just as radical as you are, we stand for the people of the north and for the people of the south and for the people of the north and for the people of the south.

DEL. RHODES: I want to say thank God, too. The program is certainly clear enough. It makes it possible for us to make inroads and progress in a country that has been largely unoccupied. We join you in your program, nothing about our section of the country, since this farmers' program can not hurt you to at least let us have it in our state down there.

DEL. MORGAN (Minn.): I am opposed to the last amendment to insert the word "land." In Minnesota where I travel a good deal among the farmers, many of them are coming to us and the point on which so many of them have split has been the argument constantly set up by the opponents of Socialism who say: "These Socialists propose to take your little farm, or your house and lot and they propose to make it all public property. Now the effect of that was so great that an amendment was introduced to the national platform and carried; and that is the one that has commended itself to our farmers. They are willing to concur in the platform that we have adopted, against the private own-

ership of land and means of production used for exploitation. They agree with that. They agree that no man should be allowed to hold land for the purpose of exploiting his fellow man, but he ought to own, until the conditions have radically changed, he ought to own his little house and lot; he ought to own his little patch of land and so long as he is willing to not do support of himself and family and not to exploit others, and that principle of the program has brought thousands of farmers to us. Now if you put this word in the farmers' program and say that the Socialist Party demands that all the means of transportation shall be socially owned we shall find that this fight all over again, and that this question has been asked me hundreds of times: Do these fellows propose to take my little house and lot away from me so that I won't have a place of my own to lay my hands, and we have referred them to the platform and said yes, if you use your house and land to exploit somebody else, renters or anybody else, anything of that kind, that will be the ultimate outcome, but so long as you use it simply for your own good you will not be deprived of the ownership of that value of which you have so largely produced yourself. That statement has brought us hundreds of farmers; that statement has succeeded in bringing those people to us. But if you will adopt this last amendment you have simply knocked in the old platform to pieces. We are back in the old fight again, and we can not own even a piece of land to be buried in, and I will have to turn over the graves of three of my dear ones to the Socialist commonwealth at some future time. I shall have to beg a place to bury them in under those circumstances.

DEL. SLAYTON (Pa.): I am not now a farmer but I was raised as one. That is the reason I grew so tall. I am not in favor of that part of the amendment that says "the land." I am in favor of the reasons given by my comrades but I wish to say in reply to Comrade Slobodin when he asks if there will not be a conflict between those working on the railroad who want higher wages and the farmers who want cheaper transportation. Yes, But if we shall not make a demand for social ownership for that reason will not the same conflict rage between the farmer who raises his produce for sale and the men in town, the workers in the city to whom that produce is sold. Does not the wage earner in the town ask more wages in order that he may get more of the product of the farmer, and does not the farmer raise the price of his product if he can, to get more of the wages of the worker? Therefore you are not changing the program any. If it is inconsistent to ask for the social ownership of the things named in paragraph 1 or recommendation 1, it is inconsistent anywhere else. I insist that this is not a special program for the farmers as indicated by my comrades down here, any more than it is a special program for the wage earner when you ask for the social ownership of the shop in which he works. I agree with you that no nation can exist half slave and half free, and I admit that when you ask for immediate demand for the wage worker, when you ask you ask for more wages, if it is a special program for more wages, if it is a special program to ask the same things for the farmer then it is a special program to ask it for the wage worker.

DEL. STREBEL (N. Y.): In other words we understand that it is in the nature of an immediate demand, part of the im-

THE CHAIRMAN: The delegate can answer that question for himself just as well as I can. I should like to hear from the delegate who has read the article.

DEL. SLOBODIN (N. Y.): Assuming that all this is carried and you have adopted

it, and assuming that the result is as you anticipate, and the farmers rush into the Socialist Party and they begin to have great weight in the Socialist Party, and

COM. SIMONS: I can answer for Com. Simons: I will be with the agricultural unions go out and work against the party, what will be the position of Simons?

tural laborers. Section 2 of the recommendation was then adopted. Section 3 was then read as follows:

"We demand the retention by the national, state or local governing bodies of all land owned by them, and the continuous acquisition of other land by reclamation."

purchase, condemnation, taxation or otherwise; such land to be organized as rapidly as possible into socially operated farms for the conduct of collective, agricultural enter-

prises." DEL. OHSOL (Mass.): I move to substitute the words "gradual acquirement" for the words "continuous acquirement" I

the second line.
DEL. MORGAN (Minn.): This gentleman had the floor and I wanted to call your attention to the fact that he was discussing the whole question. You ruled that he had

THE CHAIRMAN: It is necessary to exercise some discretion in this discussion.

I hope the delegate will not arise to speak on every plank, but I think the house will recognize that it is fair to have this amendment settled one way or the other.

DEL. OH SOL: Comrade Thompson said that the third section covered exactly the point that we wanted to cover in the first section, the question of the socialization of the means of production. The third section is

the land. Now, if the third section is to mean this, it should be clear. There is a ambiguity. It states "the continuous acquisition of other land." As it stands no requirement of other land." As it stands no

we have already the land owned by reclamation. That can be publicly owned under the capitalistic government. If you mean all land you should say all land, but that now owned by the state or nation.

sides that now own the land. It is only fair to be clear on this point. If you say gradual acquirement of the land you will then have the people becoming owners of all the land.

whether used for transportation or the raising of stock or any other agricultural purpose. Therefore, I suggest that all the comrades who really stand for the social

Let it be clear. It may eventually come about that the agricultural laborers will rise against that program and we shall

have to have two partners, one for farmers and one for the farm laborers, at least employers and agricultural laborers. All those in favor of public ownership should support the amendment.

ment. DEL. BYRD (Tex.): I happen to have been born and raised on a farm. My father

shall have him to say we are not in agreement as stated by the ministerial committee who referred to Leviticus 24:23 will not cover the crime, because we don't want to veil the title in God, for we are the revelation of God and we are the

not in all on this matter. I don't want to take a position with reference to the ownership of the home or the home land, but we do want the ultimate collective ownership of all productive land. Therefore, I offer this amendment.

DEB. STALLARD (Kear): In this discussion the main feature has been whether we should have the collective ownership or the individual ownership.

of all minds, or whether we should have the private ownership of land so long as that land is not used for purposes of exploitation. That, briefly stated, has been the main bone of contention. I have taken the floor to call your attention to one fraction of the floor to the Socialist Party. The supreme power of the Socialist Party is the referendum ballot of the rank and file. At the last convention in 1908 the

convention adopted a declaration of public ownership of all land, and in about three months' time, by an overwhelming majority vote of the membership, that section was repealed. If you wish to adopt farmers' program you should adopt a program that the rank and file of the party want; and I do not believe that the rank and file of the Socialist Party has serious

Now, I believe personally that some time in the far distant future that no man will privately own a place to bury himself or garden spot, but I do not believe that social development has reached the point that we should demand that now; and I may be wrong in the prediction that it will ever come. This is a matter of an immediate

program and not a matter of means and ends. We want a program that fits with the present conditions. At the present time we are not ready for the nationalization of public ownership of all land, and for that reason I think that any amendment as a part of this program that would call for immediate public ownership of all land should be voted down.

RESOLUTIONS.

The CHAIRMAN: The hour will proceed.
The Secretary will proceed having arrived at the resolutions that are before us.

RESOLUTIONS.

Resolution from Tacoma protest against Judge Henford. Referred to Committee on Resolutions.

Resolution from Seattle protesting Garrison (in

Resolution from Local New York urging the party to establish publishing concerns
Referred to Committee on Communications and Publicity

as to women candidates for President : Vice-President. Referred to Committee Resolutions. Referred from Local Glenville, Seco N. Y., offering a plan of Socialist control of the means of production and distribution. Resolutions.

Resolution by W. P. Collins as to pay expenses of contesting delegates. Referred to Committee on Constitution.

Resolution by W. P. Collins as to void endium nominations for President and Vice President. Referred to Committee on Ways and Means.

Resolution by eighteen members of the House with leave of absence from duty to attend to business at home. Referred to Committee on Privileges and Elections.

delegation charging the party with

ing conservative. Referred to Committee on Resolutions.
 Resolution by Delegate Alexander and others opposing commission government. Referred to Committee on Resolutions.
 Resolution proposing amendment to Article 2, Section 6 of Constitution. Referred to Committee on Resolutions.
 Resolution from Young Socialists' League, Philadelphia, for a National Committee of Young Socialists. Referred to Committee on Resolutions.
 Resolution from Young Socialists' League, Philadelphia, for a National Socialist Sunday School Committee. Referred to Committee on Resolutions.
 Resolution by E. R. Meitzen to discontinue publication of weekly syndicate articles. Referred to Committee on Resolutions.
 Resolution by North Dakota delegation as to a Socialist banking program. Referred to Committee on Resolutions.
 Resolution by Delegate Christian (Mont.) favoring telegram to Joseph J. Ettor and Arturo Giovannetti. Referred to Committee on Resolutions.

Resolution by Delegate Oyler (Neb.) with reference to owning party press. Referred to Committee on Resolutions.
 Resolution by five delegates from Oregon demanding that the organization be kept strictly of a working class character. Referred to Committee on Resolutions.
 Resolution by Mary L. Gerts and others as to qualifications for state political candidates. Referred to Committee on State and Municipal Program.
 Resolution by W. P. Collins and others against military character of Boy Scout movement. Referred to Committee on Resolutions.
 Resolution by Delegate Zitt as to holders of political offices resigning from positions in the party. Referred to Committee on Constitution.
 Resolution by Duncan opposing the Dillingham Bill. Referred to Committee on Resolutions.
 Immigration question. Referred to Committee on Resolutions.
 The convention then adjourned until May 16, 1912, at 10 o'clock A. M.

FIFTH DAYS SESSION.

The convention was called to order by Chairman Lee.
 The following delegates accepted nominations for Chairman of the day: J. J. Carey of Pennsylvania, James H. Goebel of New Jersey, Winfield R. Gaylord of Wisconsin, W. P. Collins of Colorado.
 The vote resulted as follows:
 Carey, 74; Goebel, 60; Clayton, 29; Collins, 18; Gaylord, 18; Smith, 6.
 Comrade James P. Carey was declared elected Chairman of the day.

The following accepted nominations for Vice-Chairman:
 Lewis J. Duncan of Montana, W. P. Collins of Colorado, May Wood Simons of Kansas, Charles A. Byrd of Texas.
 The vote resulted as follows: Simons, 100; Duncan, 47; Collins, 21; and Byrd, 10.
 Comrade Simons was declared elected Vice-Chairman of the day.

On motion, the reading of the roll call of delegates and of the minutes of the preceding day were dispensed with.
 Communications of greeting were received from the following:
 Cigarette Makers' Union of New York, Seventh and Eighth Ward Branches, Workmen's Circle, Rochester, N. Y., Polish Section Socialist Party, Cleveland, Ohio, Workmen's Sick and Death Benefit Fund, United States of America, Uptown Jewish S. P. Branch, Philadelphia, Pa., Polish Section, Philadelphia, Secretary, S. P. Local, San Diego, Cal., Central Committee, S. P., Boston, Mass., George R. Lunn, Mayor, Schenectady, N. Y., English Speaking Socialist Club, Lawrence, Mass., Branch 367 Workmen's Circle, New York, Third Ward Branch, S. P., Elizabeth, N. J., Branch 14, Workmen's Circle, Providence, R. I., United Garment Workers, No. 54, Brooklyn, N. Y.

The following communications were read by synopses and referred to the committee as stated:
 Petition from Jewish Branches of Cincinnati, Ohio; referred to the Committee on Constitution.
 Resolutions from Jewish Branch, Boston, Mass.; referred to Committee on Resolutions.
 Resolutions from Branch West Huntsville, Ala.; referred to the Committee on Resolutions.
 Resolutions from Local Kansas City No. 1, addressed to the Missouri delegation, moved and seconded; referred to the Committee on Platform; referred to the CHAIRMAN: The next order is unfinished business. I think nearly everything is unfinished. But we will now take

up report of Committee on Farmers' Program, clause 3.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON FARMERS' PROGRAM.

THE SECRETARY: The amendment of Ohsolet of Massachusetts which is before the convention is to strike out the words "continuous requirement" from the third section, and to insert instead thereof "gradual acquirement of all land." The amendment offered by Strickland of Ohio is to insert the words "socially productive" before the word "land." On a vote the amendment to the amendment by Strickland of Ohio was lost.
 The amendment by Ohsolet of Massachusetts was also lost; and the original recommendation of the committee was adopted.

DEL. STREBEL (N. Y.): Rule 23 limits debate to four hours. I should like to inquire how much of the time remains on this report.
 THE SECRETARY: We have used about three hours.
 DEL. STREBEL: I move that the Chair now fix the time when the debate will close.

THE CHAIRMAN: The debate will close according to the Chairman's watch at ten minutes to eleven.
 DEL. MERRICK (Pa.): I move that the debate close in thirty minutes.
 The motion was seconded and adopted.
 The Secretary then read clause 4 of the farmers' program, which was adopted.

Clause 5 and clause 6 were also adopted.
 Clause 7 was then read by the Secretary, DEL. OHSOLET (Mass.): I move to insert the word "not" after the word "with" in the second line and to insert the word "not" after the word "and" in the third line.
 DEL. FURMAN (N. Y.): I would like to have that read as amended to see what sense it makes.

THE SECRETARY (reading): "We call attention to the fact that the elimination of farm tenancy and the development of socially owned and operated agriculture will not open new opportunities to the agricultural wage worker and will not free him from the tyranny of the private employer."
 DEL. THOMPSON (Wis.): I move that that motion be laid on the table.
 The motion to lay on the table was seconded and declared carried by the Chair. A division was demanded.
 A point of order: The motion to lay on the table is out of order as the original motion was a negative of the whole proposition.

THE CHAIRMAN: The point of order is not well taken. The question before us is the verification of the vote.
 DEL. GAYLORD (Wis.): Does the motion to lay on the table carry the whole proposition?

NATIONAL SOCIALIST CONVENTION

| State | Yes | No |
|--------|--|---|
| Ala. | Y. T. Maxwell | Mary O'Reilly W. E. Rodriguez S. Steadman G. N. Taylor G. H. Thompson W. W. Turner Janet Fenimore S. C. Garrison W. H. Henry James Oneal S. M. Reynolds W. Sheffer Florence Waitles J. J. Jacobsen I. S. McCrillis |
| Calif. | Jas. Baxter Margaret D. Brown Lee W. Lang Geo. D. Brewer O. H. Blase A. W. Ricker S. M. Stallard | J. L. Nachman Wm. Bessmer Max Boehm T. Clifford D. L. Davis D. J. Farrel W. H. Jones Dan McCurtain Wm. Patterson Marjorie Prevey C. M. Priestap C. E. Rathenberg Anna K. Storck L. A. Zitt F. N. Prevey J. G. Willis |
| Conn. | J. R. Jones C. W. Staub | G. A. England A. E. Harris Dr. J. Stosett J. E. Carter A. G. Fenner J. M. Caldwell R. Lawrence P. Mahoney Rose Tenner G. E. Roever, Jr. D. A. White J. A. Chasol F. Ashton J. E. Lockwood J. A. C. Menon |
| Del. | J. R. Jones C. W. Staub | G. A. England A. E. Harris Dr. J. Stosett J. E. Carter A. G. Fenner J. M. Caldwell R. Lawrence P. Mahoney Rose Tenner G. E. Roever, Jr. D. A. White J. A. Chasol F. Ashton J. E. Lockwood J. A. C. Menon |
| Ill. | J. R. Jones C. W. Staub | G. A. England A. E. Harris Dr. J. Stosett J. E. Carter A. G. Fenner J. M. Caldwell R. Lawrence P. Mahoney Rose Tenner G. E. Roever, Jr. D. A. White J. A. Chasol F. Ashton J. E. Lockwood J. A. C. Menon |
| Iowa | Jas. Baxter Margaret D. Brown Lee W. Lang Geo. D. Brewer O. H. Blase A. W. Ricker S. M. Stallard | J. L. Nachman Wm. Bessmer Max Boehm T. Clifford D. L. Davis D. J. Farrel W. H. Jones Dan McCurtain Wm. Patterson Marjorie Prevey C. M. Priestap C. E. Rathenberg Anna K. Storck L. A. Zitt F. N. Prevey J. G. Willis |
| Kans. | Jas. Baxter Margaret D. Brown Lee W. Lang Geo. D. Brewer O. H. Blase A. W. Ricker S. M. Stallard | J. L. Nachman Wm. Bessmer Max Boehm T. Clifford D. L. Davis D. J. Farrel W. H. Jones Dan McCurtain Wm. Patterson Marjorie Prevey C. M. Priestap C. E. Rathenberg Anna K. Storck L. A. Zitt F. N. Prevey J. G. Willis |
| La. | J. R. Jones C. W. Staub | G. A. England A. E. Harris Dr. J. Stosett J. E. Carter A. G. Fenner J. M. Caldwell R. Lawrence P. Mahoney Rose Tenner G. E. Roever, Jr. D. A. White J. A. Chasol F. Ashton J. E. Lockwood J. A. C. Menon |
| Me. | J. R. Jones C. W. Staub | G. A. England A. E. Harris Dr. J. Stosett J. E. Carter A. G. Fenner J. M. Caldwell R. Lawrence P. Mahoney Rose Tenner G. E. Roever, Jr. D. A. White J. A. Chasol F. Ashton J. E. Lockwood J. A. C. Menon |
| Mass. | J. R. Jones C. W. Staub | G. A. England A. E. Harris Dr. J. Stosett J. E. Carter A. G. Fenner J. M. Caldwell R. Lawrence P. Mahoney Rose Tenner G. E. Roever, Jr. D. A. White J. A. Chasol F. Ashton J. E. Lockwood J. A. C. Menon |
| Mich. | Jas. Baxter Margaret D. Brown Lee W. Lang Geo. D. Brewer O. H. Blase A. W. Ricker S. M. Stallard | J. L. Nachman Wm. Bessmer Max Boehm T. Clifford D. L. Davis D. J. Farrel W. H. Jones Dan McCurtain Wm. Patterson Marjorie Prevey C. M. Priestap C. E. Rathenberg Anna K. Storck L. A. Zitt F. N. Prevey J. G. Willis |
| Minn. | Jas. Baxter Margaret D. Brown Lee W. Lang Geo. D. Brewer O. H. Blase A. W. Ricker S. M. Stallard | J. L. Nachman Wm. Bessmer Max Boehm T. Clifford D. L. Davis D. J. Farrel W. H. Jones Dan McCurtain Wm. Patterson Marjorie Prevey C. M. Priestap C. E. Rathenberg Anna K. Storck L. A. Zitt F. N. Prevey J. G. Willis |
| Mont. | J. R. Jones C. W. Staub | G. A. England A. E. Harris Dr. J. Stosett J. E. Carter A. G. Fenner J. M. Caldwell R. Lawrence P. Mahoney Rose Tenner G. E. Roever, Jr. D. A. White J. A. Chasol F. Ashton J. E. Lockwood J. A. C. Menon |
| Neb. | J. R. Jones C. W. Staub | G. A. England A. E. Harris Dr. J. Stosett J. E. Carter A. G. Fenner J. M. Caldwell R. Lawrence P. Mahoney Rose Tenner G. E. Roever, Jr. D. A. White J. A. Chasol F. Ashton J. E. Lockwood J. A. C. Menon |
| Nev. | J. R. Jones C. W. Staub | G. A. England A. E. Harris Dr. J. Stosett J. E. Carter A. G. Fenner J. M. Caldwell R. Lawrence P. Mahoney Rose Tenner G. E. Roever, Jr. D. A. White J. A. Chasol F. Ashton J. E. Lockwood J. A. C. Menon |
| N.H. | J. R. Jones C. W. Staub | G. A. England A. E. Harris Dr. J. Stosett J. E. Carter A. G. Fenner J. M. Caldwell R. Lawrence P. Mahoney Rose Tenner G. E. Roever, Jr. D. A. White J. A. Chasol F. Ashton J. E. Lockwood J. A. C. Menon |
| N.J. | J. R. Jones C. W. Staub | G. A. England A. E. Harris Dr. J. Stosett J. E. Carter A. G. Fenner J. M. Caldwell R. Lawrence P. Mahoney Rose Tenner G. E. Roever, Jr. D. A. White J. A. Chasol F. Ashton J. E. Lockwood J. A. C. Menon |
| N.M. | J. R. Jones C. W. Staub | G. A. England A. E. Harris Dr. J. Stosett J. E. Carter A. G. Fenner J. M. Caldwell R. Lawrence P. Mahoney Rose Tenner G. E. Roever, Jr. D. A. White J. A. Chasol F. Ashton J. E. Lockwood J. A. C. Menon |
| N.Y. | J. R. Jones C. W. Staub | G. A. England A. E. Harris Dr. J. Stosett J. E. Carter A. G. Fenner J. M. Caldwell R. Lawrence P. Mahoney Rose Tenner G. E. Roever, Jr. D. A. White J. A. Chasol F. Ashton J. E. Lockwood J. A. C. Menon |

MORNING SESSION, MAY 16, 1912

CONDITIONS ON PACIFIC COAST.

Whereas, The railways and the various commercial associations of the Pacific coast, by false advertisements, have induced workingmen to come west, thereby creating a large army of the unemployed;

Resolved, That we request that the greatest publicity be given to this matter through the Socialist press and party organizations, as a warning to the workers of the Eastern and Central States to stay away from the Pacific coast, since labor conditions there are intolerable.

On motion, the resolution was adopted.

DEL. SPARGO: The next resolution deals with the policy of Socialist municipal administration to their employees.

MUNICIPAL ADMINISTRATION AND EMPLOYEES.

Whereas, The party has during the past year secured control of a number of cities, thus becoming the employer of many workers;

Resolved, That the party realizes that intelligent administration of government involves the organization of the workers in all departments of the workers' point of view on administrative methods and conditions of work.

DEL. SPARGO: We come now to an old friend, a perennial, dealings with propaganda among the armed forces of the nation.

Whereas, The prosecution admits that neither Ettore nor Giovannetti were present at the scene of the provoked riot, but claim that they by their speeches, incited, counseled and commanded violence and rioting, and as a result, a homicide took place, thus seeking to establish a precedent which is vicious and infamous;

Whereas, Ettore and Giovannetti loyally fought the Woolen Trust, bringing a substantial increase in wages to over a quarter of a million of textile workers, thereby causing a loss of revenue of \$15,000,000 per year to the mill owners of New England; therefore be it

Resolved, That the Socialist party in National Convention assembled, the indictment and trial of Ettore and Giovannetti is an outrageous and inhuman attempt on the part of the Woolen Trust plutocracy and their hirelings in retaliation for the successful revolt of the mill slaves of New England, to destroy the right to strike and the right of free speech and assembly of wage earners and to establish a precedent, in his conception, vicious in its enforcement, and detrimental to the entire working class of America, and destructive to fundamental civil rights, and further

Resolved, That the National Executive Committee be instructed to appropriate immediately \$500 for the defense of Ettore and Giovannetti and that we call upon the focus of the Socialist party to form defense funds for this purpose to be forwarded through the National Headquarters.

DEL. SPARGO: The next deals with

Whereas, The party has during the past year secured control of a number of cities, thus becoming the employer of many workers;

Resolved, That the party realizes that intelligent administration of government involves the organization of the workers in all departments of the workers' point of view on administrative methods and conditions of work.

DEL. SPARGO: We come now to an old friend, a perennial, dealings with propaganda among the armed forces of the nation.

Whereas, The prosecution admits that neither Ettore nor Giovannetti were present at the scene of the provoked riot, but claim that they by their speeches, incited, counseled and commanded violence and rioting, and as a result, a homicide took place, thus seeking to establish a precedent which is vicious and infamous;

Whereas, Ettore and Giovannetti loyally fought the Woolen Trust, bringing a substantial increase in wages to over a quarter of a million of textile workers, thereby causing a loss of revenue of \$15,000,000 per year to the mill owners of New England; therefore be it

Resolved, That the Socialist party in National Convention assembled, the indictment and trial of Ettore and Giovannetti is an outrageous and inhuman attempt on the part of the Woolen Trust plutocracy and their hirelings in retaliation for the successful revolt of the mill slaves of New England, to destroy the right to strike and the right of free speech and assembly of wage earners and to establish a precedent, in his conception, vicious in its enforcement, and detrimental to the entire working class of America, and destructive to fundamental civil rights, and further

Resolved, That the National Executive Committee be instructed to appropriate immediately \$500 for the defense of Ettore and Giovannetti and that we call upon the focus of the Socialist party to form defense funds for this purpose to be forwarded through the National Headquarters.

DEL. SPARGO: The next deals with

MORNING SESSION, MAY 16, 1912

those points I contend to you to suppress. Gentlemen, this proposition, which is manifestly in the interest of the country, and in the interest of the South, is being so managed as to suppress it. There is an important factor that must be considered. We need a national militia, and we need a national militia band of it to suppress that. I have known, in my own town, Dr. C. C. Hays, Mr. Hayswood, John W. Wood, and be named a lot in the case of conspirators—"and to save the country."

as an amendment to the constitution of the organization, and to purchase their own headquarters from the Secretary of State.¹ The organization in the county of Cuyahoga, Ohio, was known as DEL. SOLOMON in New York. I wish to substantiate the remarks made by comrade from Ohio. It makes no difference.

*See Appendix O for Foreign Speech Organization Reports.

*See Appendix C for Foreign Space Organization Reports.

breaking. A great majority of the people working in the steel mills and in the mines are foreign speaking, and we must leave these branches sufficient funds to carry on their agitation amongst themselves. The same thing should not be done in the South, that it should not be done in the separatist movement. It is high time to

Delegats Solomon that it should not be separatist movement. It is high time to

ating with you to build up a strong Socialist movement of all nationalities in this country. Now, then, in regard to making a certain amount for taxes, you could do it in all states. You cannot say 10 or 12 or 15 cents; but if you simply say that we pay one-half that will apply in all states.

Now, as Comrade Solomon has said, this Convention must work according to the rules of State autonomy. We cannot force anything down the throats of the Socialists, but I believe that all Socialists will abide by any proposition that will clearly for the advantage of the Socialist Party. And that is why we are making it. If you don't do something to advance the work of organizing and maintaining our organizations among the foreign-speaking people, somebody else will and will get them away from you. We must have as strong organizations of all nationalities, of all languages, immigrant in hand when he comes to take this country. A large number of foreign people who were active in the Socialist movement in France—and it is the same with people of other nationalities—simply they have come to America with any branch, and have dropped out entirely from Socialist activities or have become active in some other channels that are opposed to the principles of the Socialist Party. We want to get all of these people into our movement, and we ask you Comrades of this Convention, not to stick at technicalities, not to stick at a question of a few dollars—this will bring you a great many more dollars. Accept the proposition of the Committee. It is not perfect but none of you could get one that would be satisfactory to all of this Committee, one that would be perfect.

DEL. CAROLINE LOWE of Illinois: I feel that I am competent to speak on this question. Last year I served on the constitution committee, and when the foreign-speaking comrades came before me upon their proposition we were not able to make the point. Since then I have tried to make it my business to investigate the matter. I had opportunity to do so, because at one time our meeting place was in the same building with those of the foreign comrades. I noticed the foreign comrades for us to organization for the simple reason that we could not understand one word that they were saying. It was just as important that I should understand what they were saying and I could not do it. It would be impossible. It would be impossible for me to attend their meetings, and take an interest in the proceedings. And if they are to join the Socialist Party, and to work intelligently with us, they must do it along the lines upon which we can reach their people. They cannot reach their people through English-speaking organizations. The foreign-speaking men will not come into our organizations. We had exactly the same experience when I was living in Kansas City. Out from Girard, Kansas, there are several mining villages, in which the miners are nearly all of foreign birth. They cannot come into the English-speaking branches, because they do not understand our language. But we can organize them into foreign-speaking locals and do great good.

The same thing is true in connection with the Women's Department. The very fact that we have translator secretaries is a great help to us in reaching the women of foreign nationalities. In their own country, as well as here, the Finnish comrades are splendidly organized, and it is a very simple matter for us to reach the Finnish women with our message, be-

cause we have a Finnish translator who translates our message.

I speak confident that the best results will come from it. We need them in our organization, and as fast as they are educated to the point where they can come in they will come in. Just as they do in our meeting place in Chicago, they will come in as soon as they can work intelligently with us. As soon as they can understand the English language they will come in very eagerly.

DEL. LATIMER of Minnesota: There are two sides to this question. Most of the comrades that have been talking in favor of this question, represent the foreign-speaking organizations as agreeing with me absolutely as to their organization. I do not think it would be wise to establish a Jewish comrades can understand English. We need a translator, because the Jewish comrades can understand English. We need a translator, that we do not need, and that is the Scandinavian where about every day. Up in Minnesota where they came from, they are a Scandinavian—they came to the English-speaking locals, and almost destroyed several locals. I don't believe we need a separate translator secretary for the German branches. But, on the other hand, we have in Minnesota, almost 3,000 Finnish comrades. Those comrades cannot write down to the State office in English, and if you take and compel those comrades to communicate with the State office, pay their dues to it, do all their business with the State office, and force them into the organization, what are you going to do? You are going to destroy that splendid Finnish organization in the State of Minnesota. They are not organized in Finnish-speaking organizations because they desire to remain separate and apart from us. They are compelled to because they do not understand the English language. These comrades want to learn English, but you can't get anywhere by saying, "if you don't do it, you cannot be in the organization." I don't think you should have a little slow in saying that you should want to become Socialists, and you should want to become English-speaking comrades, allied with the English-speaking Socialists and paying the dues directly to the State organizations. Why, we would have to hire a translator secretary in every state where there are many of these foreign-speaking comrades, because, I know that hardly a day passes by that I do not get a letter in some South Slavonic tongue or Finnish, which I have to get some comrade to translate. They write in and ask if they can write in their own language. I think we will do much better if we just hold out the glad hand to them, and tell them to work ahead in their own organizations and come together in such things as would interest us all.

DEL. MERRICK of Pennsylvania: I move to change the amendment to 10 cents, where it says 12 1/2. The Bohemian Organization. Most of us, like myself, have been in America but only a few years. I know that the State and the Church supported Jews, against the foreign-speaking organizations. What the foreign-speaking organizations are doing on this question, is that they are fighting back, those comrades that are fighting socialism, and they have a right to do it, and it is our duty to do it and we will do it. We never stick our noses in the English-speaking organizations where they have preachers

or ministers. We never ask them. We never want to tell them "You have to throw them out." That is none of our business, because it don't hurt us in our branches. It is business of theirs. If the preacher is all right it is none of our business.

DEL. MERRICK: A point of order: there is an amendment before the house. The delegate is not so speaking to the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN: The point is not well taken. The delegate must have some latitude.

DEL. NOVAK (Resuming): So much for the Church question. I don't know where Frank got the idea that the delegates of the foreign-speaking organizations do not agree. It is only the State of New York that does not agree. As long as the foreign-speaking organizations agree by their delegates, it is all right. If he doesn't agree, he don't know anything about selling stamps. I don't think we have to take into consideration the opinion of comrades who are not experienced along this line. So I think the best we can do is to compel the others to go to conventions and congresses of the Socialist Party, and not to allow one secretary to go against the whole convention or the whole congress of the Socialist Party.

DEL. AALTONEN of Michigan: I happen to be a member of a foreign-speaking organization, viz., the Finnish, in 1910 at the congress at Chicago, provision was made for the organization of these foreign-speaking federations within the American Socialist Party. At that time there was only one or two comparatively small organizations affiliated with the American Socialist Party. Now we have six or seven, and five or six more that are likely to come in. Our Finnish organizations have nearly as many members as the rest of the organization. In 1910 our membership numbered about 6,000. Now we number 12,000; and last year the 217 Finnish locals in the American Socialist Party.

The convention was called to order at 2:30 p. m. by Chairman Carey.

DEL. AALTONEN (Mich.): Comrade George Sirola, Vice President of the Finnish Parliament, from Helsinki, Finland, is with us this afternoon. He is a member of the Socialist party of Finland and I wish to move that the floor be granted to him for five minutes to address this body.

THE CHAIRMAN: If there are no objections we will suspend the regular order. I appoint Comrades Aaltonen of Michigan and Jenner of Massachusetts to escort Comrade Sirola to the platform.

Comrade Sirola on ascending the platform, Comrade Sirola: Comrade Chairman and Comrades: I bring to you fraternal greetings from the struggling proletariat of a small nation and wish to bring to your attention a question which is very important to the Finnish people. It is the revolutionary proletarian in all lands by the last International Congress in Copenhagen. I wish to state that the gist of that question—the Finnish question—is for us by no means the maintenance of the old constitutional rights, and the State Autonomy of Finland, which rights tyrannical Czarism has endeavored to steal from us, but it is a

1st Party have transpired about \$200,000 out of business. This money has been thrown down last Congress is not price level. This shows that it does not bring the foreign workingmen in America into touch with the Socialist movement. You cannot compel him to do anything. If you could compel the Finlanders to do anything, then the Russians would have been able to compel us to do something which they have been trying to do for hundreds of years. There is nothing that can compel people who know their rights, to do anything.

All these foreign-speaking comrades have joined in this plan read by our secretary on the platform. All of us have agreed with him. The view we have taken in this matter is not to give these foreign-speaking branches any distinct national organization. That is the only proposition.

The proposition is to organize them, because I am one of those who believe in organization and nothing else. Organization is the only thing that will emancipate the laboring class. According to the last census there are about 18,000,000 foreign-born people in America. What are you going to do with them?

There have been comrades on the floor of this Convention who have said that in some localities, viz., in New York and in Cleveland, Ohio, as I understood, the foreign comrades in those localities have absolutely nothing to do with the local organizations. This is no fault of theirs. It is the fault of the American socialists, because they don't do anything in order to get in touch with them. There is not a single Finnish organization in the entire country that is not affiliated with the local and county organizations, that have been requested to do so, but in many cases the American comrades seem to have the idea of people, paying nothing to do with the American people.

The convention then took a recess until 2:30 p. m.

AFTERNOON SESSION.

The convention was called to order at 2:30 p. m. by Chairman Carey.

DEL. AALTONEN (Mich.): Comrade George Sirola, Vice President of the Finnish Parliament, from Helsinki, Finland, is with us this afternoon. He is a member of the Socialist party of Finland and I wish to move that the floor be granted to him for five minutes to address this body.

THE CHAIRMAN: If there are no objections we will suspend the regular order. I appoint Comrades Aaltonen of Michigan and Jenner of Massachusetts to escort Comrade Sirola to the platform.

Comrade Sirola on ascending the platform, Comrade Sirola: Comrade Chairman and Comrades: I bring to you fraternal greetings from the struggling proletariat of a small nation and wish to bring to your attention a question which is very important to the Finnish people. It is the revolutionary proletarian in all lands by the last International Congress in Copenhagen. I wish to state that the gist of that question—the Finnish question—is for us by no means the maintenance of the old constitutional rights, and the State Autonomy of Finland, which rights tyrannical Czarism has endeavored to steal from us, but it is a

At present when the liberties of our nation are being threatened more than ever before, the eyes of the comrades in Finland are in the first place upon the working class in the Russian proletariat; and in the second place, great industries of Capitalism, comprehending that their awakening into a conscious class struggle is a prime condition for securing democracy and liberty of the Nation.

Since coming to your country, to this mighty land of industrialism, and having opportunity to travel considerably and investigate the life and doings of the people, I am convinced that here, if anywhere, the class struggle must be fought without regard to race or nationality. I am glad to say that I have found the workers of your little land, whom Capitalism has driven here in search of a labor market and for a time to sell their labor power in small consideration, have in the international language of the working class in strikes, demonstrations, and in the ballot box, together with the American working men, I am glad also to see that they are endeavoring to bring themselves closer and closer to the American working class and with that end in view have started a college for building up a real Socialist are busy studying the use of American workers. College Comrades! Returning to the Finnish question I would like to say that I think I would like to direct your attention to the proletariat in that corner of the world, and I am convinced that you will grant your moral support and sympathy with the struggle of our Comrades there, especially at this time when the struggle is approaching its climax. (Applause.)

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN-SPEAKING ORGANIZATIONS.

THE CHAIRMAN: The question before the house is the report of the Committee on International Relations to which two amendments have been offered. I understand that there is some desire that copies of these reports be at least that they should read by the delegates.

DELL GOEBEL (N. Y.): I think it is due to the delegates of this convention that every report shall be printed in order that we may know exactly what we are voting on. I move therefore that we discontinue the discussion of the report at this time and ask to have it immediately printed to DELL SLOBODIN (N. Y.): I move to table the motion.

THE CHAIRMAN: The question now is upon the postponement of consideration until such time as the report is printed. **DELL STREIBEL (N. Y.):** I wish to inquire if this action is deferred to report.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair is unable to reply to that question. Are you ready for the question of postponing action on the report?

The motion of Delegate Goebel was then declared lost.

DELL MAHONEY (Mass.): I move the previous question.

THE CHAIRMAN: The question now comes upon the amendment. One on one side and one on the other are entitled to five minutes each. The Chair in view of

the number desiring to speak, will give the floor to members of delegations that have not spoken upon the question. Delegate Spargo of Vermont.

DELL S. SADBLER (Wash.): Has not Delegate Spargo spoken on this question? That is a point of information.

THE CHAIRMAN: Under parliamentary rules there is no such thing as a point of information. While every one of the delegates may need information the Chair will not recognize it. Delegate Spargo has the floor.

DELL SPARGO (Vt.): I ask the delegates to vote in favor of the adoption of the report of the committee. I ask that in view of the experience that we have had on the National Executive Committee during all the years that I have been on that committee, it has been one of the great possible difficulties to know how to organize in a country where the proletariat is being overwhelmingly foreign speaking, handled by distinct committees it can be borne out by the experience of our committee. It is not borne out by the experience of the party in any State in this country. We want to enable our Finnish comrades, our Swedish comrades, our Jewish comrades to maintain and carry on the splendid organizations that they have formed under this method.

A DELEGATE: You have no foreigners in Vermont. What do you know about it? **DELL SPARGO:** It is not true that Vermont has no foreigners in the State or Vermont. We depend very largely upon the State of Vermont for our movement upon the foreigner in the industrial centers, and so far as we are concerned the industrial life of Vermont is very largely maintained by a foreign-speaking proletariat. I believe that the arrangement proposed by the committee is the very best arrangement that we can possibly have. On the other hand I believe that the amendments proposed are largely speaking comrades in this country. It is said by way of objection that that is offered, that foreign speaking comrades who have learned to speak English draw out of the English-speaking locals and go into the foreign-speaking locals. That is not an objection. It is a big advantage. That is what we want to do. What can we ask better than when a comrade coming from Italy or some other country has been in the country long enough to learn the language, and in the movement long enough to understand our party where can we use him better in our English speaking branches or in the branches among the people from his own country, who must go through the same evolution and who need his help, his guidance and his experience, if we are ever to have an effective organization of those people? Vote down the amendments and adopt the report of the committee as it stands.

DELL SLOBODIN (N. Y.): It is unfortunate for delegates to speak on a subject that they know nothing about. This is not a question of allowing the foreign organizations. That is point number one. Nobody wants to abolish them, and therefore, that need not be discussed. The foreign organizations will remain, whether or not you vote and there is no question here of abolishing the translator secretaries. They will remain as they are, whether you vote for the original motion or adopt

the amendment, so that all that eloquence was wasted. What is desired here is that the language branches should remain as they are, having the translator secretaries as they have them, but that instead of buying their due stamps from the national office through the translators, they buy them from the locals and branches and state officers, and that is all that is to be discussed. Now, it is said that the Finnish organization is the most successful one, and that therefore, they must maintain the state officers. The bulk of our foreign speaking organizations. The bulk of the members pay dues to the state organization. There is only one Finnish organization in the state of New York belonging to the national organization. The rest pay dues to the different locals or to the state organization. Here is an illustration and an answer to all the arguments against the amendment. The most successful organization is paying dues just as the amendment contemplates, and why the comrades representing the Finnish organizations are against the amendment I do not understand. There is evidently some misunderstanding. The Finnish organizations would benefit by the adoption of the amendment, because they are paying double dues. This amendment contemplates giving them a remittance of dues which they have been paying, and therefore, the Finnish organizations should certainly have to pay 15c dues and then pay again to the local or organization. Under the present arrangement, what do we find? Affiliations go into the locals and pull them out of the party. Many branch many an organization has been pulled out of the Socialist party in this way. Now, this amendment will result in their maintaining their separate state organizations, but they will be an integral part of the Socialist party. Where the members speaking the foreign languages belong to the English speaking organizations, it is true they cannot correspond or talk to each other, but we see that this difficulty is overcome in the case of the Finnish organizations, which are able to carry on their correspondence. Therefore, we should vote for the amendment.

The question was put on the amendment to the amendment, that stamps shall be purchased from the locals, and the proposition was defeated.

The amendment was also lost.

The original motion to adopt the report of the committee was then put and carried.

THE CHAIRMAN: The motion of Del Russell of New York, that the report of the platform committee was made a special order for an evening session tonight (Thursday), beginning at eight o'clock.

DELL WHEELER (Pa.): I move that in all cases where committees make majority and minority reports the same amount of time be given to each report. This is not provided in the rule. I move its adoption.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair will receive a motion that does not violate the rule. The rules say that the Chairman is entitled to twenty minutes; that is the chairman of the committee.

DELL SPARGO: A point of order. At the time of the adoption of that rule, I rose and requested from the chairman of the convention a ruling upon that point,

and the convention was assured that the same amount of time would be given to the chairman of the majority and that was the understanding when we adopted that rule.

THE CHAIRMAN: That is not a point of order, but if the Secretary has that upon the records, it will stand.

THE SECRETARY: That is so.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Secretary confirms that, and it stands that the spokesmen directly for the majority and minority will both be given the time stated in the rules. That stands as the rule of this body.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON CO-OPERATIVE ALIVES.

THE CHAIRMAN: The next committee is the Committee on Co-operatives. Are they ready to report?

DELL GAYLORD: Yes.

DELL LINDGREN (N. Y.): I have a minority report.

THE CHAIRMAN: On what?

DELL LINDGREN: On this co-operative movement.

THE CHAIRMAN: Very well. Under the rule the minority may be heard. But the report is not in print. Is it necessary to have it in print?

THE CHAIRMAN: Not at all, if they take your word for it; if they do not order it printed, they will not order it printed. Delegate Gaylord, for the Committee on Co-operative Commonwealth.

DELL GAYLORD: Chairman, reporting for the Committee.

The Chairman suggests that this is the Committee on Co-operative Commonwealth. Let there be a misunderstanding on this subject, as there has been. I beg to call the attention of the delegates to the fact that the Committee is not appointed for that purpose, but to consider the facts relating to the co-operative movement and to make recommendations. Do I understand, Mr. Chairman, that the chairman reporting for the committee has five minutes before the vote is taken, to close the debate?

THE CHAIRMAN: I so understand it.

DELL GAYLORD: If that is the understanding, very well. The report is very brief, and since it is nothing but a plain statement of facts, I will with your permission read it before any argument is made.

The report of the Committee on Co-operatives was then read.

Chairman: (Vice-Chairman Mr. W. Simons in the Chair.)

DELL GAYLORD: This report is signed by all the members of the Committee except the Chairman. The members of the Committee saw the beginning of the Committee's work that he was opposed to the co-operative movement in any sense and to having it recognized, but would not object to its being investigated, and would report further in his own behalf.

Now, the statements, which are here in this report formulated, coincide with other recorded statements of the International Socialist movement. Delegates wishing to verify this statement of mine can secure, at the literature stand in the lobby here, copies of the report of the Socialist party delegation and proceedings of the International Socialist Congress at Copenhagen in 1910. I think they will charge you a nickel for it; they charged me that much.

The report is printed in full. Appendix E.—Editor.

On page 16 of this document is given in full the resolution on co-operation, with something of the discussion, and there is something of the American delegates voting adopted, the American delegates voting in its favor. There has been a development in the attitude of the Socialist movement with reference to the co-operatives in other countries. It is well known that in the earlier days Lassalle proposed co-operative societies which should be founded by the aid of capital to be furnished by the state. This was ridiculed, on the other hand, by others. If I do not give this history accurately, there are those here who are able to do it. I give it as best I may from such study as I have been able to make.

Others in the Socialist movement in Germany ridiculed this idea, saying, "What state will give aid to a working class movement of co-operatives unless it be a Socialist state?" And then you would need co-operatives." And so for the time being that whole question was brushed aside and the political agitation concentrated very largely the attention of the workers of that nation and that movement.

Gradually, however, there came in the insistence upon the possibility of gaining for the workers some benefit through the co-operative movement. In the industrial co-operatives, and in the consuming societies, as they called them, we know as distributive co-operatives.

Opposed to this argument based upon what has been called the iron law of wages, namely, that it was impossible by the cost of their living, through the supposed success of the co-operatives, the argument being—and Engels made this argument at one time—that if, in any given community the cost of living is reduced by twenty per cent., the only result will be that the capitalist class will then reduce wages by a similar amount, and then the workers will not be any better off.

In the face of this argument, in the face of the strong prejudice, in the face of the well known handicap to any such co-operative effort in any kind of a working class community, the co-operative movement nevertheless began, prospered, grew and thrived in Germany, until today it takes hold of unfavorable opinion by the fanatics of them with capital owned by the workers, avowedly for the purpose of improving industrial conditions, and makes good. They do it, that is all, they do it. Maybe they cannot do it, but it is not orthodox; perhaps not to Marx or Engels; and perhaps not to the classical literature. The Socialist party does not ask nor recommend that the Socialist party of America here today shall endorse the co-operative movement. The co-operative movement does not care whether you endorse it or not, any more than the labor union cares. That is the fact. If you oppose it you will concentrate the energy of those who favor it. If you recommend it you will have and there temporarily increase activities which may for the time being, because ill advised and hasty, lead to temporary failures. We ask you neither to endorse nor to condemn. We ask you simply to look it over. There it is. Go and find out what it is, before anything further is said. But, it is there in our report. We do not claim advanced personally, but the report simply states that those who are most closely connected with this

movement claim benefits of three specific kinds, and these are mentioned in the report. I trust that the comrades will notice carefully the language of the report. Don't think we are saying something which we are not saying, and don't think we are trying to get you to do something which we do not ask you to do. The benefits claimed relate, first, of food furnishing of an improved quality of food and other supplies. Second, the actual increase of economic resources in the control of the purchasing of things of those who co-operate and things are claimed. And then, third, these training of the workers in the capacity of administering their own economic affairs.

These are the claims. Personally I think the claims are justified. I do not think you representing the Socialist Party ask you to say so, and I do not understand that the adoption of this report justifies or fortifies or endorses this claim. All it does is to appoint a committee to go out and investigate the facts and report from time to time the facts concerning the co-operative movement.

We ask you to do this, your Committee do, in view of the failures, this note of warning which is sounded in this report. Co-operatives fail. Well, all kinds of business fail anyhow. Even the trusts are busted sometimes and swallowed up by each other, and if some co-operative stores and other enterprises should fail, it is of course to be expected. Let us find out why they fail in a majority of cases, and find out the conditions which are favorable to their failure, and find out the conditions under which they succeed; and if the investigation shall prove what is claimed by some, that the American soil is unfavorable for this sort of effort, so in the part of the working class, so far as I am concerned, my mind is open to the fact on that matter, and I am not prepared today personally to make any positive statement as to a final conviction. I am open to facts.

Meanwhile, the statement that there is no successful co-operative movement in the United States is not borne out by facts presented to your Committee. One living in New York City and the other in Duluth, both of them having had considerable experience in the handling and promoting of these wide correspondence with other persons now engaged in these lines of business, reported to us such facts as they have found. In Wisconsin says Mr. Kaplan, there are upwards of 100 branches of the American Society of Equity. Mr. Vlas, who has had extensive correspondence with those carrying on co-operative enterprises, says there are upwards of 100 societies organized and carried on in connection with other organizations under the name of the Workers' Union in Wisconsin. Mr. Kaplan says there are upwards of 100 co-operatives in the four states of Wisconsin, Michigan, Illinois and Minnesota.

Putting together these two, it looks as though there were about 200 enterprises within the knowledge of these comrades. A minimum statement as to the amount of business that these stores do is in the neighborhood of \$2,500 a month. Putting together this total, it looks as though we were justified in saying that there was somewhere in the neighborhood of \$5,000,000 worth of business done by these en-

I think in a year. That is conservative, I think you will admit.

Comrade Vlas reports that in the eastern part of the country there are in the neighborhood of 600 Italian local organizations carrying on co-operative enterprises of various sizes, and all of them successful, some of them exceedingly so. He reports others carried on by other nationalities, Bohemian, Finnish and other nationalities. There are also other farmers co-operative organizations scattered throughout the country. Your Committee did not have at hand any definite information excepting common knowledge, as we say in the report, concerning co-operative enterprises in other parts of the country, and meeting that one member of our committee for instance, to whom exists in Seattle supplying goods to wholesale co-operative live stores on the western coast, mainly in Washington.

Thus we are in fairly close touch with these different wings of this movement. Understand at once that there is no central organization, but that there is a widespread organization throughout the nation, in practically every state. I myself, can bear witness, having traveled in most of the states and run across it. In the southwest they are numerous. Another member of our Committee, Comrade Cumble, is in personal contact with them in Oklahoma, and so we know they are there. We know they have been in existence somewhere upwards of twenty years, having lasted over from the old Gange days. So we cannot deny the existence of the co-operative movement in the United States, though it is not unified.

Now, if in other countries the workers have found it possible to secure ownership by groups of workers of industrial and commercial capital, to administer and use this capital for their own interests, and if the workers have thus increased their economic resources, have thus been able to fight their industrial battles, and have thus been able to finance their political battles, that is a matter of great interest to us.

In addition to that, Kautsky and other writers in the Socialist party movement, and Gonzale of Belgium, have pointed out the fact of the educational effect upon the workers concerned in the management of these co-operative enterprises. Gonzale especially points out the necessity for the training, the discipline, the development of the capacity of self control on the part of the workers to enable them to administer the business of society. And the only way to learn to do is to do. I know of no other way in which I learned to do things but by doing them. Some comrades protest that I talk too much. That is because I have talked a good deal and learned how to talk. I did not learn to talk by keeping quiet.

Now, your Committee is not prejudiced in favor of one way or another, and in favor of the economic conditions in the United States such as are made possible, and some things seem to bring forth this economic movement. It does not wait for us to tell it. It is not our business as a party to undertake the organizing of the co-operatives any more than it is our business to undertake the organizing of labor unions of any kind. But as individual workers, if any find that under given conditions in different communities we can benefit ourselves as workers and can den-

ent the working class by proceeding in this direction, we shall do it, whether the Socialist party approves or not. It is a proper function of the Socialist party to discover the facts concerning this movement, its possibilities, its history, and to make such recommendations and statements of fact as may prevent the comrades from making costly experiments which are unnecessary when experience is available.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chairman rules that in order to bring this matter before the house the minority report will be heard before we proceed to discuss. Is the report for the minority ready?

DEL. GAZZANO: I was going to make a motion to accept the report. I move to accept the report.

MINORITY REPORT.

DEL. LINDGREN (N. Y.): In bringing this minority report before you, I want to say at the beginning that I have no intention at all of belittling the co-operative movement or anything that the co-operative movement or anything that the working class as a whole might benefit from making the minority report. It is that in the majority report it practically contains an endorsement of the co-operative movement, and I do not think that we, as a convention here, should endorse anything that we do not know something about.

Now, I want to point out something to Comrade Gaylord. He says this is not an endorsement. I will read the first section of his report: "Just as the labor unions fight for industrial self control for the working class, the socialist party for political self control, and the labor and Socialist class for intellectual self control for the workers, so the co-operative movement fights for an increasing degree of economic self-control for the workers through the ownership and use of industrial and commercial capital by organized groups of the workers."

Now, we all know that labor unions do benefit the working class in their fight for immediate demands. We also know that the press, and the Socialist party means to benefit the workers. But as yet, there have been no facts laid before us that the co-operative movement as such will benefit the workers in America. I contend that the conditions in this country, as far as the co-operative movement is concerned, are not the same as they are in Europe; and even though many have been recognized by the International Congress at Copenhagen, we want to take into consideration that the international Congress also endorsed the immigration question when they endorsed the race question which when they endorsed them, they did not know the conditions that existed in America.

The Socialist party today at this convention, if a vote was taken here, would stand divided on those two questions, and the co-operative movement as such is in the same position. We do not know anything about it. Now I want to read this report to you.

(Del. Lindgren then read the minority report, as follows.)

MINORITY REPORT COMMITTEE ON CO-OPERATIVES.

At the present stage and strength of the Socialist Party, I am opposed to it endorsing in or endorsing any form of co-operative business for the following reasons:

NATIONAL SOCIALIST CONVENTION

1st. That it has been the experience in those sections where efforts have been made along co-operative lines, to draw away from the party active members for merely rendering invaluable services to its propaganda work, and thus localities party organization in such localities.

2nd. That in such co-operatives, funds used in establishing co-operatives, invariably diminished the financial assistance rendered to the party organization, for propaganda and at this time, there are but this country, as this time, there are but a few, in any sections where the Socialists are sufficiently strong in numbers to make such proposition feasible without jeopardizing the party's activity and growth.

3rd. That in such sections which have come under my personal knowledge and observation this movement has been dis-rubbed, and party members who had advanced money lost in most cases all they wanted. Other reasons could be advanced but I think the two first are sufficient to cause this convention, to recognize the proposed step of going into co-operatives, especially, business co-operative propositions as dangerous to the growth and progress of the party.

The impatience of some comrades and their enthusiasm to push the Socialist Party ahead, should not or for it to stampede this convention by experience more the knowledge gained by experience of the past.

I therefore recommend that a committee of five (5), be elected by this convention to investigate the relation between the co-operative movement and that of the Socialist Party, not alone in its relation to the working class as consumers, but also to the producers, this committee to report at the next National Congress of the Socialist Party.

Fraternally submitted,

E. LINDGREN

DEL. LINDGREN: I want to say that in making these statements I speak from personal experience. In Brooklyn we had three co-operative stores which failed within one year. There was probably lost during that time anywhere from three to five thousand dollars on the Brooklyn stores. In those sections the party or where these stores existed the party organization was, you might say, disorganized. The active members in the party organization who took up the co-operative work, when these stores failed they staid away from the party organization. It required us practically a year and a half to build up the organization again in those sections of Brooklyn where the stores had existed. Of Brooklyn, but it has been the experience of several sections on Long Island, and in some parts of New Jersey, in which, I believe, the delinquent will bear me out, where co-operative stores have existed.

Another reason, which I believe is probably the strongest reason for not endorsing it or for not taking it up until we investigate when Comrade Kaplan was brought out when the prices of the commodities had gone down. I asked, at the Committee meeting that the prices of the commodities had gone down, at the time when the prices went down, wages were also down, showing that the co-operative, admittedly, is no benefit for the workers, and that we as such should not take up, and it is simply for a reduction in wages that we should we bother with it? WHY

should we waste our time with it? Personally I do not see anything in it. It is merely a policy of Socialism of some sort which we as Socialists should not go into. I move the adoption of the Minority Report.

(Motion seconded)

DEL. KAPLAN (Winn.): I would like to move an amendment to the Majority Report, unless Comrade Gaylord will be willing to the Committee say: "Following the path of other national organizations of the Socialist party, the Socialist Party of America must recognize the right of existence on the American continent of a successful co-operative movement." If he would strike out the word "unsuccessful," leaving the rest stand as it is in that section, I would not insist on the motion. (Amendment seconded)

THE CHAIRMAN: There is a motion to amend.

DEL. KAPLAN: Will Comrade Gaylord, or rather majority, accept that amendment?

DEL. GAYLORD: I can see what may be possibly construed there. If that means finally successful absolutely successful I could not plan furnished the best. But Comrade Kaplan furnished the best evidence for the use of that word himself.

DEL. KAPLAN: Not unless it is understood.

DEL. GAYLORD: There are individual co-operative stores which are successful and have been so for years, and there are many of these.

DEL. KAPLAN: There are many private corporations that are also successful.

DEL. GAYLORD: That is not in the co-operative movement.

DEL. KAPLAN: Well, I ask whether you will accept that?

DEL. GAYLORD: Perhaps you better let the convention pass on that.

DEL. KAPLAN: I would say, speaking to the amendment, that I had to this position: Fundamentally, it is a movement under the Capitalistic state, to organize the productive powers of working class, of the country, and unite them as producers and get the trade union distributive field—and if then you unite the working class—and by working class I mean the farmers and the city workers—you have within the capitalist state, a developing factor that will be a far greater movement of this country, trade union say, it all depends upon the But, and say, it all depends upon the possibility of unifying. Without the co-operative movement you cannot have co-operation.

Comrade made the statement as the committee of the minority report has gone away, that wages in Duluth had gone down, but I did say in reply to an immediate question that it did not tend to an immediate reduction of wages in Duluth and elsewhere. To the question of wages, I answered, yes, and I still answer yes. But, remember, you can reduce the cost of living for a year or two years right away, and it is going to take down in that community or in the state or in the nation, and until that time comes, in the meantime you have an opportunity of developing.

DEL. TUCK (Cal.): A point of order. The motion before the house is to adopt

AFTERNOON SESSION, MAY 16, 1912

The Minority Report. The amendment of the Majority Report to the Minority Report, and therefore his motion is out of order.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair rules that Comrade Kaplan is in order. He has one minute more.

DEL. KAPLAN: As I say, I am in favor of the Majority Report with this amendment. To me does not imply that the national Socialist party shall go on record in favor of endorsing the co-operative movement. The sole point is this: Do we consider it important enough to elect a committee for the purpose of studying this question, getting all the facts possible from every source available, and presenting them to the next national convention of the Socialist party? That is what I understand to be the whole proposition.

DEL. FURMAN (N. Y.): I am opposed to appointing a committee to spend two years on the subject, and then come in like all committees, generally speaking, that have been spending two years, and have no report. Let every one of you make yourself a special delegate to come here two or three years from now, and give something about the questions that will come before the convention without being told things by people who do not know anything about what they have been appointed to investigate. We have had this thing in Brooklyn and it has been stepped on by some fool, and crook that wants to come in and utilize this proposition to impose himself upon the Socialists with co-operative stores, and such things as that. We have worked and did not get any pay for it. We put our money in and did not get it out again. We have had all kinds of things, and the result has been that in those sections the party has been disorganized.

Delegate Cumble here raised a point of order which the Chair ruled not well taken.

DEL. FURMAN: I think I am speaking pretty well to the point, when I am talking about a committee of five to be appointed, which was suggested by both committees in both reports. It does make any difference whether you appoint a committee or whether you do not, till you get any report, it won't be until they come here, and they won't know anything about the subject, those delegates coming here two years from now, after four years from now. As I say, we have had experience in Brooklyn, on Long Island and in many sections, and in all those districts where the co-operative movement was tried the Socialist organization was entirely dropped in some instances, and it was organization utterly disorganized, and it was a year and a half in one place before it was restored. They had to go to work and reorganize all over again, just through the attempt to start something among the Socialists in this country so as to keep the help with Europe. You cannot make any comparison between the conditions in this country and those in Germany. Here we have a great big country with a few Socialists together. You can not start a co-operative store unless it be a language store, where the patrons that start the co-operative will remain with each other and go to the store on account of the language spoken. But to generally neglect the starting of business for the sake of uplifting, as Comrade Gaylord says, and helping the Socialist Party, it is

a rope of sand, a mill stone around the neck of that section where you undertake it.

DEL. PREVEY (Ohio): We have had some experience in our local in the way of forming a co-operative store, and we have thrown away nearly half of our membership in the course of five months. I believe we may possibly in a year get a dividend of ten cents. The co-operative movement has no business in the Socialist movement. If individuals wish to start co-operative stores, let them do it as individuals, but not as organizations. To my mind it is like trying to perfect a little heaven inside of an eternal hell. (Applause.)

DEL. ROSEY (Md.): I move to amend the Majority Report by inserting, immediately after the first line of the last page, the following: "The committee shall make a special effort to ascertain what bearing the degree of industrial development and organization in any particular locality has upon the operation of co-operatives in that locality."

A point of order was made that the Majority Report was not before the house for consideration.

THE CHAIRMAN: I believe the point of order is well taken, and that the Chair probably ruled wrong in the case of Comrade Kaplan. Let us dispose of the Minority Report. I will hear the comrade from New York.

DEL. BURCKLE (N. Y.): I would like to go on record as opposed to the Majority Report, for the simple reason that I am absolutely convinced that if we are going to endorse the Majority Report it only means that we are going to absorb the great amount of energy, I am, on the other hand, also absolutely convinced that if we are going to concentrate all these energy on the political field with all these questions, which are nothing else but mere branches of the immediate demands for the solution of the evils in society, we will be absolutely wasting our energy over these demands, whatever they may be. Therefore, I say, comrades, I am convinced that we have no right to destroy, in this way, our activity by indulging in these demands.

Indulging and organizing various organizations. I would be in favor of endorsing the Minority Report. At the same time I would like to call your attention to the fact that the minority as well as the majority demands the election of a committee of five to report to you at the beginning of the next convention.

The previous question was then ordered.

DEL. LONDON (N. Y.): A point of inquiry. We have a majority report before us and the original motion of the minority report is in the nature of an amendment to the majority report. This amendment is offered to the minority report, is an amendment to the amendment. Thus we have six and seven different propositions before us, and we do not know how to vote on them. I ask for a ruling. I ask the Chair to rule that the majority report is the original motion and the minority report is an amendment to the majority report, and that the amendment to the majority report is an amendment to the amendment. In this way you will have the entire question before the convention.

THE CHAIRMAN: I shall rule as I started to rule in the beginning, that the majority report is before the house, that the minority report is an amendment to an amendment.

to have the co-operative movement

stand the commissary department

on Del. Alexander (Tex.) raised a point of order against the recognition of Del. Hillquit's motion after the chair had stated what the motion was going to be. THE CHAIRMAN: That is not a point of order. The Chair desires Robert on the particular rule in Robert on the previous question his statement that there may be a possibility of cutting off debate on the amendment and yet opening it up on the main question, his statement lacked correctness in this particular. That without specifically stating when the motion was carried, the previous question is made and carried, it applied to the entire subject applied in the absence of said that it applied, only to the pending amendments. The Chair was in sending Hillquit of New York borrowed money and read it over again, error. Del. Alexander and I was wrong, and he is quite right and I was wrong. I am the only Chairman that ever admitted that he was wrong. Now, in order to in a quiet way console myself for my error, I insisted that another exposition of Robert should be made, after which one on either side will have an opportunity to speak on the previous question was then ordered.

DEL. SMITH (Tttn): What I have to say won't take long. This report does not bind the Socialist Party simply as derivative principles. The report asks that a committee appointed by the convention to study this subject,

DEL. GARIBOLDI: The definition of the words suggested that a denial in these words of the committee to make a special effort to ascertain what effect industrial development and organization in any particular locality has upon the operation of the co-operative in that locality. If there be no objection I will add this as part of the majority report.

THE CHAIRMAN: No objection is heard and it will be so ordered.* The question now comes upon the adoption of the majority report.

The motion to adopt the majority report of the committee on co-operatives was then carried, and the report adopted.

TO THE PARK

THE CHAIRMAN: The next business is the report of the Committee on Labor Organizations and their relation to the Socialist party which was made a special order. Delia Hartman will report for order. Delia.

DELIA HARTMAN: Before making any statement for the committee on this subject I will ask that the Secretary read the report.

THE CHAIRMAN: Comrade Willie Massachusetts, secretary of the committee, will read the report.**

WILLIE MASSACHUSETTS: I move that Delia Clifford (Ohio): I move that

adoption of the second from all parts of the motion was seconded from all parts of the hall.

THE CHAIRMAN (Cal.): I have twenty minutes to speak on this proposition.

ty (Chies of "Question.")

DEL. S. SADLER (Wash.): You have insisted that one on each side has the right to talk. I hope you will carry that out in this case.

DEL. THE CHAIRMAN: This is unanimous. DEL. THE CHAIRMAN: It won't be opposition. A DIRECT SPEECH: There will be opposition. If you speak, "Question," there will be no (Chies of "Question.")

THE CHAIRMAN: The convention is in business done in due amount to put a motion and order. I am of this convention rose badge. A member of this convention has been expelled. If you would have yelled to talk they had you could now have five minutes. Now if anybody else wants five minutes will get the floor. I speak as Chair.

DELL HARRIMAN: No, you mean of the committee

man I like Commander DEL. AMERINGER (OK.): No, you don't. I am Chairman of the committee.

DEL. HARRIMAN: Let me explain my position. Comrade Ameringer asked me to make a statement before this convention. When he asked me to make that statement I presumed I was speaking as Chairman, but I misunderstood him.

*For convenience, the passage referred to has been inserted in the report, Appendix E.—[Editor.]

**The report is printed in full as Appendix F.--[Editor.]

A DELEGATE: A point of order. A Chairman cannot delegate his time to another member of the committee.

THE CHAIRMAN: I have ruled that anybody else can talk. Don't bother the convention by telling the Chairman what is so palatable, even to a delegate from Ohio.

(Cries of "Question.")

THE CHAIRMAN: No business will be transacted until every delegate has taken his seat and the Chair has stated the parliamentary status of the matter before the house. The situation is this: A committee reports unanimously. A motion is made to adopt. The Chair presented the motion. In the absence of a motion for the previous question or to lay upon the table the Chair recognizes a member of the convention to speak upon the motion. The member is Comrade Harman. What more member is Comrade Harman. What more member is Comrade Harman. What more member is Comrade Harman.

DEN HAROLD (Cal.) I will take only five minutes of your time, and it is the first five minutes that I have asked the courtesy of this convention for. There is a difference between us in this convention. This very demonstration is the evidence of it. We had many a long and weary hour working over this resolution. Six of us reported and the other four finally said they believed that they would sign it because it came as near to being for as any resolution that could be got through this convention. Now the whole situation is this, in a nutshell, so that we may see the reason for our differences. There are in America two great movements, the economic movement on the one hand and the Socialist party on the United States on the other hand. They have fought separately for a quarter of a century or more. The political party has succeeded in drawing into its ranks 15,000 or more only. The labor movement has a much greater number in its ranks and men. After a quarter of a century of fighting separately, after having failed through all this time to come together for whatever reason—I won't discuss that now—there are some within the ranks of the political party that are losing hope in the efficacy of political action. I hear a cheer—I knew that was true. On the other hand, the labor movement having conducted its fight on the line of strikes and boycotts alone, for that quarter of a century, there are men there who, having come up against the trusts, have lost hope in the efficacy of the strike and the boycott. Thus standing separately and having lost hope, they tend toward direct action or syndicalism. Whenever a nation loses hope of a peaceful solution of a problem, that moment all the elements of war are present. Whenever a class or a portion of a class loses hope in its policies, loses confidence in its policy, all the elements of war are there and the idea of direct action grows and a change takes

Now between these two great movements comes a movement toward direct action, individual, direct action, a tendency towards syndicalism, and this thing that we have in America today is the germ of a syndicalist movement. And the longer you remain apart, the stronger will grow your syndicalist tendencies.

We have here shown that there is a tendency within the labor movement to combine the trades into federations and industrial unions, that the growth is going on there, and if the Socialist party of America comes up close to these men, their war our war, makes them

struggle—not for a strategy but for ideas—states that our strategy, makes one common fight with both these powers, that moment you will develop a power in the american movement that will make the american movement and the independent syndicalist movement and the independent working class party involved with the political and the economic organizations in one solid phalanx. That is the proposition. (Loud cheering.)

Now look at our resolutions, and read them carefully. For, comrades, what we

What were is to understand each other. We want to know each other. Remember, you who have a tendency towards syndicalism are just as honest and square in your fight as are those who have a tendency toward exclusive political action; we have a tendency to go too far in that direction or think that all depends on that.

Listen! You might wipe out political action; but you can never wipe out the struggle for bread. Yet the moment you wipe out political action you have squandered against the army and navy as did our syndicalist movement in England and they turned back to Parliament and asked for a law for a minimum wage and minimum hours. That fact will germinate in the syndicalist movement in England the idea of the necessity of political action in that movement.

Now the question is, men and women contracts shall we separate these two? (Shouts of "No!") Shall we organize dual unions to fight the political organization or to fight the economic organization? I say, no! We are coming together. Let us do everything within our power, leaving every member as do the Germans, quoting from our friend and fraternal colleague, if not in words yet in spirit, let every one of us belong to the labor or generalization, not only belong to it, but fight it.

The economic fight, this is the thing that catches the conscience of the king. It is power that your class must develop. You cannot develop power by division. We may have our theorists, but your power cannot develop power by separation. The economic organization grows out of the struggle and the struggle grows out of the economic organizations. The Socialist party says to the workers where you are working, what you are doing, for the struggle for life, or what you are going to do in your struggle against capitalism, this we will do with you in one united fight.

You don't scatter literature when a man is starving; you throw a beefsteak in his mouth; after you have done that he will read. The literature you will put

Now we see socialism, as I conceive it, has one purpose, and that is to apply its philosophy; not to theorize about it, but to apply it. If our theory, if our philosophy has not arisen out of the struggles of the working class, and does not enable us to conduct the economic fight for that class, then our theories and our philosophy will not avail us much. If the material concept is true, if the conception that men live by bread, and that their ideals are dependent on the bread is true, then let us apply our philosophy to every struggle, for every struggle of the working class against the capitalist class is right, from the standpoint of the working class.

AFTERNOON SESSION, MAY 16, 1912

L. F. HAEMER,
Committee on Foreign Nations.

Del. Burkle of New York moved to amend the paragraph reading: "and further that the Socialist Party maintain the right of the working class for complete emancipation from slavery under any form of civil government," by striking out the word "civil" in the last line, making it read "under any form of government." Wells of Washington moved to amend by striking out the reference to the high cost of living, inasmuch as the Socialist Party is concerned primarily with the overthrow of capitalism.

The amendment being seconded, the original motion was put to adopt the reworded motion as read, and carried.

THE CHAIRMAN: Tonight at eight o'clock we hold a session of this convention in this hall, when the platform will be considered. Please so inform the delegates who went out to congratulate themselves on our unanimity.

Larsen, a regular delegate from Illinois, having arrived, the Illinois delegation arrived.

EVENING

The Chairman called the convention to order at 8 p. m.

THE CHAIRMAN: Under special assignment of the Platform Committee, I will now be read.

REPORT OF THE PLATFORM COMMITTEE, Chairman C. E. Russell read the report for the remarks:

THE CHAIRMAN: It gives the Platform Committee of this convention your great satisfaction to say to you that your committee reports unanimously take it as another indication of that beautiful and attractive feature of this convention, and without any preliminary remarks, I will read to you, with your permission, this report.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair awaits a motion.

DEL. HENRY (Ind.): I move its adoption as read.

DEL. WILSON (Cal.): I call your attention to the fact that the editors have omitted one strong paragraph at the top of page 2, Comrade Ghent must have the paragraph concerning Duncan's impeachment in the courts, and it ought to be added. It was in the original draft.

DEL. HENRY (Mont.): There is just one sentence omitted. The whole paragraph should read:

In addition to this legislative juggling and this executive connivance, the courts of America have sanctioned and strengthened the hold of this plutocracy as the United States and other decisions strengthen the slave-power before the civil war. They have been used as instruments for the suppression of free speech and for the assembly.

DEL. BERGER: There is another mistake there. In the sixth line from the beginning it should read "hundreds of millions of dollars" instead of "millions of dollars."

THE CHAIRMAN: The motion before the house is the adoption of the report of the committee as read. I want to move DEL. BARRY (Wash.): I adopt down to the Working Program and that the rest of the matter be taken up serialism.

tion has had him seated in place of Carrol, alternate. It has also elected Adolph Germer to replace the relieved. Who has asked to be relieved.

The Oklahoma delegation has decided to seat M. F. Barker, a regularly elected alternate, in place of Pfeiffer Barker having been previously absent.

If there is any objection, the delegates will be seated. Everybody seated.

THE SECRETARY: A correction of the minutes has been handed in. The motion immediately morning, regarding the sending of a telegram immediately to the Governor of California, was made, I am informed, by Bessemer of Ohio, and not by Sadler of Washington, as I have it in the minutes. I believe Sadler voted for it, however.

Another correction. The motion to adopt the third clause of the report of the Committee on Farmers' Program was made by Merrill of New York and not by Duffy of New York, as I have it in the minutes.

SESSION.

DEL. HILGUTH: I wish to offer an amendment to the political demands, page 4, 10th clause. The amendment is to one clause: Under Political Demands, demand 10, which reads:

"The abolition of the present restriction upon the amendment of the constitution so that that instrument may be made amendable by a majority of the voters in a majority of the States." It shall read "by a majority of the voters in the country." A majority of the voters in the majority of the States may happen to be about 10 or 15 per cent of the voters of the country, as against 80 or 85 per cent. We want majority amendments and not minority amendments, accepted. Russell, for the committee, accepted the amendment offered by Del. Hilguth.

DEL. LE STURGEON (N. D.): I wish to offer as a substitute for Section 5 of the Industrial Demands the following: "By the co-operative organization of the industries in the Federal penitentiaries, for the benefit of the convicts and their dependents." BARNES (Pa.): We have a number of amendments here, each separate and distinct; do you hold, Mr. Chairman, and they must pass upon them one at a time?

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair holds simply that at no time will he permit more than two amendments at one time before the body. The motion before the house is the adoption of the report of the committee. The amendment by the delegate from Washington was that it apply simply to the preamble, and that the Working Program be considered serialism, by suggest that the motion be made unanimous consent to take the amendments up serialism.

On motion of Del. Barnes it was voted to take up the amendments serialism.

THE CHAIRMAN: The delegate from Washington moves that that part of the platform, up to where the words "Working Program" occur, be on that ready for the question (Y/N): This will go to the referendum of the party member.

*The platform as adopted is printed in full as Appendix G, pages ————Editor.

ship, and when approved by them stands rather as a declaration of the party. We are acting, so to speak, as their clerk. I suggest it might possibly be more accurate to prepare it in a form so that it will read: "The Socialist Party declares, etc." Also, to separate it from every preceding and following declaration, some date should be placed at some point on it.

THE CHAIRMAN: Does the delegate offer it as a motion?

DEL. GAYLORD: I offer it as a motion.

DEL. BARNES: I will state that it has always been the practice of the National Party when platforms were printed to state, either at the top or bottom, that it was adopted in convention, on such and such date, and endorsed by referendum vote of the party, in such and such a paragraph, on the first page, it should not be limited to Republican and Democratic executives.

DEL. RUSSELL: There has been in this country for a great many years no other executive than Republican or Democratic. Consequently we could not use any other phrase. There are no legislative representatives of other parties except those that come from the Socialist party, and we would not like to restrict those. This restriction is carefully based and accurate. You cannot include any other representatives, because these are the only executives we have had.

DEL. PERKIN: We have had Populists. We have had non-partisans—this is not a party.

DEL. RUSSELL: Well, a non-partisan party is not a party.

DEL. GAYLORD: I move to amend the fifth paragraph on the first page by inserting the word "rent" after the word "extortion," so that it reads: "The farmers in every State are plundered by the increasing prices exacted for rent, freight rates and storage charges."

DEL. RUSSELL: The committee accepts the amendment.

DEL. RICHARDSON (Cal.): All that is needed now is to place at the beginning of it: "The Socialist Party of the United States declares," and at the end, "Adopted at Indianapolis," such and such a date.

A DELGATE: I would like to inquire if they made the change that was requested by a delegate from Oklahoma; I think Delegate Russell said that it was accepted. If it was, I want to move that it be changed back like it was at first: "The people are forced to work. It looks like they chose to work for a living. No one works for a living unless they are forced to do it."

DEL. RUSSELL: All right. Any way they want it.

DEL. MARGARET PREVEY (Ohio): You had an able committee and they have given the matter careful attention. If we attempt now to change the report, a word here and a word there, the platform would be a wordy document when we get through. I suggest that we get together and change it word in one pertinent paragraph. It will probably be necessary to change all paragraphs in order to harmonize with that particular one. I am sure you will agree with me that it has been given careful attention by the very able committee whom you have elected for the purpose, and I believe it will be well to leave it in the form in which they have reported it to the convention. I believe it is a document that we can

be proud of and that we will be proud to hand to the people of the United States, and ask them to vote for it. Do not, I repeat, ask them to vote for it.

DEL. DONNAN (Mont.): I simply want to continue in the same vein in which Comrade Prevey has just spoken. This platform that has been brought to you are four or five different versions of the five books of Moses and it takes a skilled scholar to go through and separate and put out who wrote what. That is what has happened to this platform. All through there has been the work of four or five different ideas and statements of the same principles. It is a very fine piece of carpentry on the part of the redactor. Only those on the committee will be able to go on and say, "I put that in," or, "I put that in." It is put together well. If you attempt this process of putting in a word here and another word there, the next thing you know you will have spoiled the continuity of the whole thing. So I hope if it is possible because if we will have to put this thing together again there is no knowing where we will get at it.

The previous question was called, and the report of the Platform Committee adopted unanimously.

DEL. WHEELER (Pa.) read that after the labors of the last few days with all the diversity of opinion which we have had here, and considering that we have adopted just previous to this another great document, and are now considering what is in my estimation the greatest contribution to the Socialist literature since the Communist Manifesto, it has been said heretofore that contributed anything to the Socialist literature of the world. It can no longer be said. This convention has done a marvelous thing: It has leaped twenty years; it has harmonized interests and opinions which any man here would have said four hours ago could not have been harmonized. I say, I had no hope that it would be done. I believed those opinions would be irreconcilable, but within a few hours things have developed so that there would seem to be no place to differ. The committee has done a great thing that we were members of this convention and were able to bury all differences and rise to this mighty occasion to carry the American Socialist movement over the most dangerous period in its existence. We are now passing through an occasion that was most critical and its outcome must terrify the capitalist class of the nation. I hope we may adopt this platform unanimously. I am sure there is no serious defect in it.

The question then came upon the adoption of the preamble, which was carried unanimously.

THE CHAIRMAN: We are now to consider the following paragraphs of the working programme, serialism. The Chairman of the Committee will read the first paragraph.

DEL. KOOP (Ill.): To facilitate matters I move you that in reading these paragraphs, if there are no objections, the Chairman will declare them adopted.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair intended so to do.

Chairman Russell read Paragraphs 1, 2, 3 and 4, to which no objection was raised.

and we already have it in the platforms of the different States; you accept this amendment that the class struggle is enlarged according to your suggestions, to cover every phase of the Federal work shops as well as the Federal penitentiaries.

DEL. LE SEUER: As to Federal work shops in the Federal penitentiaries, let the committee work that in.

The substitute paragraph was then adopted.

The Secretary then read clause 6 as follows:

"6. By forbidding the interstate transportation of the products of child labor, of convict labor and of all uninspected factories and mines."

The section as read was then adopted.

"7. By abolishing the profit system in Government work and substituting either the direct hire of labor or the awarding of contracts to co-operative groups of workers."

The paragraph as read was adopted.

"8. By establishing minimum wage scales."

The paragraph as read was then adopted.

The next paragraph was then read as follows:

"9. By abolishing official charity and substituting a non-contributory system of old age pensions, a general system of insurance by the State of all its members against unemployment and invalidism and a system of compulsory insurance by employers of their workers, without cost to the latter, against industrial diseases, accidents and death."

The paragraph as read was then adopted.

Paragraphs 1 and 2 of the "Political Demands" were then adopted, reading as follows:

"1. The absolute freedom of press, speech and assembly."

"2. The abolition of a graduated income tax, the increase of the rates of the present corporate taxes and the extension of inheritance taxes and graduated in proportion to the value of the property, and to nearness of kin, the proceeds of these taxes to be employed in the socialization of industry."

Section 3 of the Political Demands was read as follows:

"3. The gradual reduction of all tariff duties, particularly those on the necessities of life. The government to guarantee the re-employment of wage earners who may be unemployed by reason of changes in tariff schedules."

DEL. BARNES (Pa.): As it appears to me this paragraph concedes the argument of the tariff advocates that tariffs do give employment to working men, and so far from any knowledge goes that is not now healthy in infant industries are fat and further explanation of the reasons for the retention of this clause from the committee I move that we strike out the word "gradual."

The motion was seconded.

DEL. BERGER (Wis.): We have avoided just the very thing that Comrade Barnes is afraid of. We state there that the government shall guarantee re-employment of wage earners who may be unemployed by reason of changes in tariff schedules. Now I would like to see any tariff reformer from Underwood down stand for anything of this kind, there is no tariff reformer in the cap-

italist world who can touch this clause. We have taken care of an argument of that kind, Comrade Barnes.

DEL. BARNES: You don't answer my point.

DEL. CLIFFORD (Ohio): It seems to me the height of absurdity for the Socialist party to be concerned with the tariff. We are not interested in high tariff, low tariff or no tariff. The workers are skinned to a finish, tariff or no tariff. The Democrats and Republicans have blathered about the tariff until the whole country is sick of it. But if I had my way you would not have any immediate demands at all.

DEL. IRVIN (Pa.): Clause 3 merely provides as we have provided before where in the development of machinery workers are put on the scrap heap. In the change of tariff whether you believe in high tariff or low tariff workers are put on the scrap heap. That can not be successfully denied. And that merely covers that proposition and nothing else.

DEL. KATIE SADLER: I am absolutely opposed to this notion. High tariff or no tariff, it does not concern us. I lived where we had no tariff at all and I was just as poor then as I am now under a high protective tariff. I have been just as poor under a tariff. I don't see why we should bother with such a thing. The tariff question in America is not enough, just as we were fooled in England and Scotland about free trade, the open door, protection, reciprocity, and all the other free things that the old parties have been offering us. Our delusion is absolutely opposed to all immediate demands but we will have to swallow them if you force them down our throats. But for goodness sake don't split on the tariff question.

DEL. MERRICK (Pa.): We have got this very thing in our congressional district, John Dazell, the high priest of protection, was defeated in our district by a tariff revisionist. We have to show the fallacy of revising the tariff. Perhaps if Comrade Berger will get the statement of Senator Cox he will see that Senator Dazell is in the floor of the United States Senate in this debate with Senator Aldrich that is far from the working class as concerned it does not make any difference whether it is high or low in the middle.

We have had this honest in certain congressional districts and the man who defeated John Dazell defeated him because the Republicans in that district had begun to say that it would be a good thing to put the tariff down. They would say to us, you stand for the same thing that Mr. Kelly stands for. Therefore, why should we vote for the Socialist when Mr. Kelly stands for exactly the same proposition. I am in favor of the motion of Comrade Barnes.

DEL. RINGIER (Pa.): I move the previous question.

The previous question was then ordered.

DEL. BARNES (Pa.): I very much wish that the committee had vouchsafed the information in advance of my argument why they favored this proposition. The gradual reduction of all tariff duties, particularly those on the necessities of life, the government to guarantee the re-employment of wage earners who may be unemployed by changes in the tariff schedules. There was an argument presented by Comrade Irvin of Pennsylvania which does not apply, in my

judgment, because I do not concede that the adoption of free trade would throw one man out of work in America. You are providing for that which will not happen. You provide that the government shall re-employ those who are discharged by reason of the reduction of the tariff, and I hold and believe that it can not be demonstrated that any one will be thrown out of work, and on the contrary if we had free trade, and on work it would not throw anybody out of work. It would be a week's work of virtually for more than a week's work of virtually conceding the argument of the tariff supporters in this paragraph, and that is the reason why I am in favor of striking it out. While I hold to the opinion that we would not bring about disemployment by a reduction of the tariff, I know, you know and the tariff tinkers know, that a great number of the products of America are sold in foreign countries far cheaper than they are sold to us in America. You can get a Douglas shoe in London, England, cheaper than you can here. You can get an American sewing machine in England cheaper than you can here. You can get a McCormick reaper cheaper in the City of St. Petersburg than it is sold in the city of Chicago; and it is made in the city of Chicago; and it is the testimony of Mr. Schwab before the Congressional Committee he admitted that he sold it cheaper to the Russian government than he did to Uncle Sam. The government of the tariff would not bring about disemployment but it would reduce their profits. The reduction of the tariff will not disemploy anybody, but will make the capitalists richer and cut off some on the tariff issue.

DEL. BERGER (Wis.): I have always held that the tariff issue is not a workmen's issue.

DEL. BARNES: That is what I think. I have always told them that there is always free trade in labor. That while our manufacturers are protected by 300 per cent in some instances, that there is always free trade in labor. However, we are facing a condition and not a theory. We have to take a stand. In all the countries that I know of where we have a Socialist party, the Socialist party as such takes the stand for free trade more or less. That is the international view. However, that is the situation in this country we face the following situation: Entire cities, entire communities have been built up by the high tariff. If there should be a sudden reduction of many thousands would be thrown out of employment. I am not saying that by this paragraph. I am not saying that the Socialist party should make free trade or high tariff an issue. We have a thousand better issues. We are simply explaining our stand on this question, and it seems to me that this clause is all right.

DEL. HILGUTH: How are they to be re-employed?

DEL. BERGER: The government to give them employment. The government can do it. This does not mean that we should go out and preach free trade or that we should take a stand for high tariff. It simply explains our position on the tariff. But for my part I shall never make an issue of the tariff. I hope that you will accept this as a read adopted by a vote of 117 ye and 54 no.

Paragraph 4 was then read as follows:

"4. The abolition of the monopoly ownership of patents and the substitution of

collective ownership, with direct reward to inventors by premiums on royalties."

The paragraph was adopted.

The Secretary then read Section 5 as follows:

"5. Unrestricted and equal suffrage for men and women."

Section 6 was then read by the Secretary as follows:

"6. The adoption of the initiative, referendum and recall and of proportional representation nationally as well as locally."

DEL. LEWIS (Ore.): I object to the proportional representation. It will only open the way for parties of reform, prohibition parties, labor parties and so forth. Our State legislatures will be full of all kinds of representatives. It is a dangerous proposition. Are we Socialists going to open up the field to give all kinds of freaks to have their representatives in the various bodies? Proportional representation means that we are going to give life to all the parties, strike out clerical parties, I move to strike out proportional representation.

DEL. SMITH (Mass.): It seems to me that instead of advocating proportional representation the Socialist party ought to be standing for representation by absolute suffrage. The point of the compromise from Oregon is certainly well founded. If the Socialist party makes as its fundamental declaration that this is a struggle between classes, then we ought to have absolute majority representation. We ought to have either capitalist government or working class government absolutely.

DEL. SOLOMON (N. Y.): It is evident that the comrades who spoke in opposition to the recommendation of the committee do not know what they are talking about. They seem to be carried away by a few stock phrases. This proposition will be favorable to some reformers, that is enough. That settles it. As a matter of fact the Socialist movement of the world has always been in favor of proportional representation. I do not understand how anybody who understands the meaning of proportional representation with there is but one party who can really benefit by it and that is the Socialist party. The comrade from Montana says we should either have a capitalist government or a Socialist government. If that is the case we may as well stop putting up candidates and sending them into the legislative assemblies.

DEL. SMITH (Mont.): I said a capitalist government or a working class government.

DEL. SOLOMON: As I understand the comrades it must be either a capitalist government or a working class government. That is identical with saying a capitalist government or a Socialist government. I cannot conceive of a Socialist government which is not at the same time a working class government. But coming down to this proposition really there is but one party that that is the Socialist party. The Socialist party has state funds to keep per cent of the total vote cast, but has no representative whatsoever in the assembly. If we had proportional representation it would be possible for the party to have representation in the assembly in proportion to the vote cast for the party candidates.

passed the resolution as it comes from the committee.
The motion of Comrade Hillquit to strike out Section 16 was lost by a vote of 66 aye to 142 no.
Section 16 was then adopted as reported.
Section 17 of the report was adopted.
Section 17. The immediate curbing of the power of the courts to issue injunctions.
Section 18 as reported was read as follows:
"18. The free administration of justice."
It was moved and seconded to strike out the word "justice" from clause 18 and insert the words "the law."
DEL. HOGAN (ARK.): I am opposed to the amendment that it seems has been accepted by a majority of the committee. For the reason that the administration of law is not always the administration of justice. I favor the original declaration of the commission that will stand for the free administration of justice. I have been practicing with the procedure in our courts, and especially the Federal courts, where I have appeared time after time, and I assure you if you accept this amendment, which I am sorry to say, this committee of which I have the honor to be a member saw fit to accept. I hope you will vote it down.
The motion to substitute the words "the law" for the word "justice" was carried.
Section 19 was then adopted as follows:
"19. The calling of a convention for the revision of the Constitution of the United States."

DEL. FURMAN (N. Y.): I want to incorporate into this platform an anti-military plank. I think it is a question of great importance. Everyone of us knows that the militia, and everything that trails with it, is turned against the working class every time there is a conflict between the working class and the master class, and I want a distinct understanding. I want a declaration that everyone will understand that we are opposed to the militia in this country because it is always used in behalf of the capitalist class, and I want the committee to make it as strong as it can be made.
DEL. HILLQUIT: I make the point of order that the delegate has the right to call for a plank generally.

DEL. FURMAN: I want the committee to put the plank in there.
A DELEGATE: This should be referred to the Platform Committee to draft this particular clause.
DEL. FURMAN: That is my motion.
THE CHAIRMAN: Are you ready for the motion to refer this to the Committee on Platform?
DEL. FURMAN: I made no motion.
DEL. REILLY (N. J.): He said he would like to have incorporated in the platform an anti-military plank, but the Secretary is not bound to consider that a motion.
DEL. STRICKLAND: I am opposed to having this go back now. The military history has been taken care of in resubmission introduced by Ohio and already adopted.

THE CHAIRMAN: The motion of Delegate Furman is to recommit it to the committee for a plank on anti-militarism.
The motion of Del. Furman was lost.
On motion of Delegate Strickland, seconded by Delegate Betlyn, the platform as a whole was then adopted.
DEL. ZITT (IND.): I have tried for five minutes to offer a plank.
THE CHAIRMAN: The only question before the house was the adoption of the platform as a whole.
DEL. DUFFY (N. Y.): We have sticken out the plank on the tariff. Now the tariff is an issue.
A DELEGATE: A point of order. We settled that a while ago.
THE CHAIRMAN: We have had a very full discussion of the question of tariff.

DEL. GOEBEL: Tomorrow morning one of the most important matters coming up for consideration will be reported having up ask on behalf of the Constitution Committee that we be permitted to have our report taken up as the first order of business tomorrow morning. We are proposing so many changes that are vital, and that should be carefully considered and discussed. I therefore ask that the Committee on Constitution be allowed to report the first thing tomorrow morning.
DEL. KOOP (ILL.): I move that the Committee on Constitution be the first committee to report in the morning.
The motion was carried.
The motion was then adjourned until Friday, May 17, 1912, at 10 A. M.

SIXTH DAY'S SESSION.

Del. Carey, Chairman of the previous day, called the convention to order at 10 o'clock.
The following delegates were nominated and accepted for Chairman of the day: Rodriguez, Duncan, Thompson (WIS.).
The following delegates declined nomination: Hogan (ARK.), Berger (WIS.), Harman, Strickland.
The vote resulted: Rodriguez 41, Thompson 75, Duncan 84.
Del. Duncan (Mont.) was declared elected Chairman for the day.
The following delegates accepted nomination for Vice-Chairman of the day: Edwards (Tex.), Killingsbeck, Latimer, Strickland.
The following delegates declined nomination: Clifford, Thompson (WIS.), Washhope (N. Y.).
The vote resulted: Edwards 32, Strickland 87, Latimer 19, Killingsbeck 66.
Del. Strickland (Ohio) was declared elected Vice-Chairman for the day. The roll call of delegates and the reading of the minutes were, on motion, dispensed with.

WASHINGTON DELEGATION.
DEL. S. SADLER (Wash.): The rule adopted is that where a state has instructed its delegation to vote on a particular question, their vote shall be recorded as a unit. There are seven delegates in Washington that consider themselves bound by instructions from the state to vote against immediate demands, and they would like to be recorded.
THE SECRETARY: The Washington delegates would like to be recorded as voting against immediate demands in the platform.
DEL. MALEY (Wash.): I wish to have my name recorded there.
DEL. BOEHM (Ohio): I would like to be recorded as individually voting against immediate demands.

COMMITTEE ON LABOR ORGANIZATIONS.

DEL. WHITE (Mass.): I regret the necessity of calling the attention of the delegates to an uncompleted sentence in the report of the Committee on Labor Organization and their relations to the Party. If you will recall, when I was reading this report yesterday, I came to a wording that I did not seem complete. I consulted with the members of the committee, and they recognized that without the addition of the words that were in the original matter, they would be meaningless. I regret the necessity of doing this, but the members of the committee and the delegates will understand that there is no ulterior motive behind it. If you will just follow me I will read that paragraph. The second paragraph reads: "Political organization and economic organization are alike necessary in the struggle for working class emancipation. . . . working class movement." It says nothing, so you see it is uncompleted. It should read: "Political

organization and economic organization are alike necessary in the struggle for working class emancipation. The most harmonious relations ought to exist between the two great forces of the working class movement, the Socialist Party and the unions." I move you that the words "the most harmonious relations ought to exist between the two great forces of the" follow after the word "working class movement" in order to complete the sentence and make it intelligible. (Seconded.)
The motion was unanimously carried.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON CONSTITUTION.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Committee on Constitution, through the Chairman, Del. Hillquit, will now make its report. The report is most important, so delegates will please be in order. Comrade Hillquit has the floor.

DEL. HILLQUIT: Comrade Chairman and comrades: I believe the Chairman did not overstate the situation when he expressed the opinion that we are now coming to the most important part of our business. Our resolutions and our platform are very important, but nevertheless they remain only abstract expressions of opinion. Our Constitution will determine our work for many years to come, and every part of it will play a very important role in our practical work as soon as adopted.
Your committee, like the two preceding committees, has the pleasure of submitting to you a unanimous report, or at least one practically unanimous report, for out of a hundred and odd sections of the Constitution moved an addition to one of the sections, not carried in by the other members of the committee. It all other respects and in all substantial points and features, the committee is unanimous.

We proceeded upon the assumption that our Constitution required radical revision. As it stood or as it stands today it was the Constitution adopted in 1901 upon the formation of this party, with very slight changes adopted from time to time. We found that the machinery of administration which we had provided for a party of 10,000 members or less would not fit a party of 150,000, and perhaps 200,000 or 300,000 by the time we again have an opportunity to re-examine our Constitution. We have reached a point, comrades, where the organization of the Socialist Party has enormous tasks to perform. From an office

*Editor's Note: "I make the report of the convention upon this subject intelligible to the reader the entire constitution as adopted by the convention is printed as Appendix F, as this differs only in minor details from the committee's report and these changes are noted in the Proceedings, the original report is not given.